5/-

116

261
C34s
HN
31
C4

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

70396

IN THE

LIGHT OF CHRISTIANITY

(THE HULSEAN LECTURES FOR 1909–1910)

BY

W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc.

LATE FOUNDATION SCHOLAR OF JESUS COLLEGE, VICAR OF ST. GILES, NORTHAMPTON
AUTHOR OF
'THE PASTORAL TEACHING OF ST. PAUL' 'SOCIAL WORK' ETC., ETC.

Εἷς Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν.—EPHESIANS.

Ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί ἐστε· ἵνα τί ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους;—ACTS.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA
1910

All rights reserved

GOSHEN COLLEGE LIBRARY
GOSHEN, INDIANA

PIAE RECORDATIONI

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT

S. T. P.

DUNELM. EPISCOP.

PREFACE

THIS book consists of an expansion of the Hulsean Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge. I felt that if the lectures were to be useful I must be content to speak of what I knew from experience, I must attempt to do no more than testify of that with which I daily come in contact. Hence both the choice of my subject and the method of its treatment.

The lectures are, in one word, a plea for the supremacy of the ethical, that is of righteousness, in conduct, and especially in that largest and most important of all fields of conduct—social intercourse, or the social relationships in different spheres of life. This plea for the supremacy of the ethical is the plea of Christ, and therefore the supreme call of true Christianity. The danger to-day is to find various substitutes for this—the power of the purse, adventitious supremacies of birth and social position, claims to supernatural superiority, even the antagonistic methods of force or of following the line of least resistance.

All such methods are, I believe, doomed to failure,

because they do not appeal to the highest in human nature. They ignore that for which human nature was made, also its highest faculties and capacities.

These lectures make two great assumptions: first, that man was made by God and for God; secondly, that God is the Infinite Righteousness. Hence, man was made for righteousness, and therefore righteousness must rule in the most common and most important of all man's activities—his relationships of all kinds with his fellow-men.

This book has been prepared amid the many activities rightly demanded of one who is finally responsible for the work of a town parish. Its many imperfections are only too patent to the writer. Will those who read it remember the circumstances under which it has been written?

W. E. C.

NORTHAMPTON, *January* 1910.

*** To some of my readers portions of the notes which follow each lecture may seem somewhat elementary, possibly even obvious, and therefore unnecessary. But in writing them I have had in view that large and, I am thankful to say, rapidly increasing number of both men and women who are engaged in Christian social work of various kinds. A great many of these, as I find from frequent intercourse with them, require advice and guidance, both in study and in practical work. To help them to find what I believe will be useful assistance many of the notes have been written.

CONTENTS

LECTURE I

PRESENT CONDITIONS

PAGE

The lectures assert three convictions:
(1) The need for moralizing Social Relationships . . 3
(2) No ideal so high and no influence so powerful as the Christian 3
(3) Therefore Social Relationships must be Christianized 4
Ideals and influences other than Christian found wanting . 4
The method of the lectures:
(1) To state actual present conditions 5
(2) To examine the teaching of the Old Testament upon Social Relationships 5
(3) To examine the teaching of the New Testament upon the same 6
(4) To show how increased knowledge enables us to meet new needs 6
Society more than an 'Organism' 6
[The relationship between the present and the past] . . 8
The Ideals of the Prayer Book and the failure to realize them 9
The primary need: knowledge (*a*) of actual conditions, (*b*) of their causes 10

I. *The Family Relationships:*
These at present unsatisfactory (*a*) among the Rich, (*b*) among the very Poor 12
The Rich (*a*) from a selfish individualism, (*b*) from the claims of 'Society,' shirk their responsibilities . 12
The very Poor, largely owing to modern industrial conditions, cannot discharge them . . . 12

PAGE

The character-making influence of family responsibilities 14
The value of their discharge to the Nation . . . 15
Evidences (*a*) of inefficiency for service, (*b*) of instability of opinion 16
Both due to the want of home training . . . 17

II. *The 'Commercial' Relationships:*
Temptations (*a*) to regard the 'cash *nexus*' as sufficient, (*b*) to regard the interests of employer and employed as antagonistic 18
Commercial transactions 'in terms of life' . . . 19
Every essential Social Relationship has a Divine archetype 20
The actual present discharge of Commercial Relationships 21
The oppression of the very poor.—Man as a 'beast of prey.'—The destruction of life 21
Phthisis among the poor 25
The Public Conscience awakening 26
Growth of a sense of National responsibility . . 27
Trade Combinations 28
The 'Cosmic Process' entirely unethical . . . 30

III. *The Pastoral Relationship:*
In a Christian 'purposive' society relationships should be moral 32
The influence of the Pastoral Relationship . . . 33
The need for its moralization to-day 34
The want of a more correct judgment of comparative values 35

IV. *The Relationship between Citizen and State:*
Present warring theories 37
The immense issues in the near future 39
Recent painful disclosures of an inadequate sense of responsibility 39
Electors and elected both to blame 40
For what do 'the people' care 41
The evils of party spirit 42
Office sought from secondary motives 42
The responsibility of the Community towards the Individual 44
The discharge of this improving 44

PAGE

V. *International Relationships:*

Present anxiety great.—Need for watchfulness and prayer 45

New sources of conflict 46

The causes of war immoral 46

The history of the last fifty years.—An unfulfilled prophecy 46

Two modern causes of war: (*a*) Inflammatory and irresponsible journalism, (*b*) Fortunes made through war 47

The ultimate responsibility of the Individual . . 48

As human nature is both the means and the end of all Social Relationships, so their improvement depends on the improvement, the Christianizing, of human nature 49

NOTES TO LECTURE I

A. Substitutes for Christianity 50

B. Society as an 'Organism' 51

C. 'Individualism' 52

D. Removal of Parental Responsibility among the Poor . 54

E. The Home as a Training Ground for the World . . 56

F. Commercial Transactions 'in Terms of Life' . . . 56

G. Everyday Business a 'Divine Calling' 57

H. The Different Standards of Morality in Family and Commercial Life 58

I. The Imitation of the Rich by those less well off . . 59

J. Preventible Phthisis among the Poor 59

K. Dissatisfaction with Present Industrial Conditions . . 59

L. Man, Machinery, and Organization 60

M. Ethics and the Cosmic Principle 60

N. The Influence of the Clergy 62

O. The 'Human' Method of Christ 64

P. The Limits of State Interference 64

Q. The Responsibilities of Citizenship 67

R. The Asserted Failure of Democracy 68

S. National and Municipal Institutions 68

T. The State and the Individual 69

U. Increased Causes of War 70

V. International Morality 70

ADDITIONAL NOTE

PAGE

THE INABILITY OF THE VERY POOR TO DISCHARGE THE FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES 73

LECTURE II

THE OLD TESTAMENT

That the Social Relationships are imperfectly discharged at present may be considered as proved 91
To what may we look for improvement? 92
As Human Nature their instrument and end, so the means for their improvement must evince:
(1) Deep insight into human nature 92
(2) Belief in the possibilities of human nature . . . 92
Christianity pre-eminently satisfies both requirements . . 93
Organized Christianity as old as Abraham 94
The Incarnation only an infinitely important event in the history of the Covenant People 95
From forgetfulness of this, the insufficiency of New Testament ethics frequently asserted 96
The Old Testament contains a philosophy (*a*) of History, (*b*) of Society 96
The assertion that 'Revelation is progressive' needs large qualification 97
The Ethical Teaching of the Bible regarded as revealed . . 99
The method of studying Old Testament evidence here adopted 101

I. *The Family Relationships:*
(A) OF HUSBAND AND WIFE: The 'Jahvist' narrative of Creation 102
Its principles fundamental and in a sense complete 102
The basis of the teaching of the prophets . . 104
'This is the Law, the rest is only Commentary' . 105
(B) OF PARENT AND CHILD: This relationship dependent on the last 106

PAGE
Responsibility of parents.—Obedience of children . 107
The conditions of national welfare 107
The 'moral' virtues are 'theological' . . . 108
The Covenant with Abraham: its issues . . 108
The Deuteronomic legislation 110
The message of 'Malachi' 112
The teaching of Proverbs 113
The stress laid in the Old Testament upon the Family Relationships 117

II. *The 'Commercial' Relationships:*
The difficulties of the inquiry 118
Imperfect conception of the Individual and of Personality 118
Racial characteristics of the Israelites 118
The Creation narrative upon 'Work' 119
The universality of slavery in the ancient world.—Attempts at its mitigation 120
The chief indictment by the Prophets is the oppression of the poor 122
The Prophets of the eighth century 122
The Prophets of the seventh and sixth centuries . . 123
The age of Nehemiah.—Isaiah lvi–lix—'Malachi' . 125
The Vision of the Ideal in the prophetic writings . . 125

III. *The Pastoral Relationship:*
(A) Of the Priesthood: Untrue conception of the primary duty of the Old Testament priesthood . 130
The office not primarily ceremonial, but for revealing the Divine Will 130
The indictment against the priesthood in the eleventh century 131
The scathing denunciation by Hosea . . . 131
The ideal of the priesthood in Deuteronomy xxxiii. 132
The rebuke of 'Malachi' for neglect of intellectual guidance 132
(B) Of the Prophets: The Ethical Revelation the *raison d'être* of the order 133
The essential conditions (*a*) of insight, (*b*) of courage 134
Fidelity to truth a primary requirement . . 134
Righteousness implies right relations, and is the essential condition for the establishment and maintenance of these 135

PAGE

IV. *The Relationship between Citizen and State:*
The State is a theocratic institution 136
Obedience to the Law the condition of social welfare . 136
The constitution of Israel originally democratic . . 137
The Prophets the champions of the rights of the people 137
Patriotism in the Old Testament 137
The high ideals of citizenship in the Prophets and Psalms 138
Politics and religion inseparable 138
The patriotism of Isaiah, Amos, and Jeremiah . . 139
The ideal, the Messianic State, always in the background 140
This State the extension of the Messianic Ruler . . 141

V. *International Relationships:*
Very early history largely a history of war . . . 142
War in the Old Testament regarded as a Divine punishment 142
The conqueror, though a Divine instrument, often destroyed 143
War the result of inhumanity within a nation . . 143
The blessings of peace clearly taught in the Old Testament 144
The abolition of war dependent on the Christianization of human nature 144
The Old Testament everywhere asserts the inevitable results of breaches of Divine inexorable laws . . 145
Its teaching, still useful, because elementary and fundamental 146
The appeal of Savonarola to the Old Testament . . 147
The need to-day for the insight and courage of the Old Testament prophets 147

NOTES TO LECTURE II

A. The Appeal to the Highest in Man 149
B. Our Lord's Knowledge of Man 149
C. The Influence of Christianity upon Character . . . 150
D. Abraham and the Christian Society 151
E. The Christian Church in the True or Direct Succession . 151
F. Is Revelation progressive? 152
G. Revelation and Inspiration 153
H. '*Therefore* . . . they shall become one flesh' . . 153

PAGE
I. On the Meaning of 'Flesh' 154
J. The City having the Foundations 154
K. The 'Heart' 155
L. Statutes and Judgments 156
M. Stoicism as a Preparation for Christianity . . . 156
N. Industrialism and Slavery 157
O. The Apathy of the Well-to-do Classes 158
P. The Date of Isaiah lvi–lix 159
Q. The Old Testament Priesthood 159
R. The Ceremonial and the Moral 161
S. The Torah 162
T. The Instruction (Direction) of the Priesthood . . . 163
U. The Prophets as Social Reformers 164
V. The Sovereignty of Jehovah over Israel 167
W. Freedom 168
X. The Mitigation of War 168

LECTURE III

THE NEW TESTAMENT

Social Relationships in the Apocrypha, especially in Tobit and Ecclesiasticus 173
Through the 'Higher Criticism' our knowledge of social life in Palestine in the centuries preceding the Incarnation much enlarged 173
Family life as depicted in St. Luke i. and ii., and St. Matt. i., not a unique instance 174

I. *The Family Relationships:*
(A) Of Husband and Wife: On no subject is our Lord's teaching clearer or more insistent: the reasons for this 174
The family, in the nurture and education of children, the best of all schools for character-formation in the parents 176
Husband and Wife under one 'yoke' to further together life's purpose 177
The attacks being made upon the family to-day in the name of a pseudo-science 177

PAGE

'Will it tend to strengthen the family?' must be a test of all proposals for social reform . . 181
Two views of the family: (*a*) utilitarian, (*b*) that it is of Divine origin with a Divine archetype . 182
The issues of Christ's teaching seen in the apostolic writings 183
(B) Of Parent and Child: St. Paul on the *patria*: and on the analogy of marriage to the relationship betwixt Christ and His Church 184
His teaching on (*a*) the parental, (*b*) the filial relationships 185
The great need of clear teaching on these relationships to-day 186
The difficulties under which this teaching must be given 187

II. *The Commercial Relationships:*
(A) The Teaching of Christ Himself: Christ's own example as a life-long strenuous worker . . 188
His teaching upon (*a*) the Divinity of work, (*b*) the Divine archetypes of employer and employed, (*c*) the need of intelligent co-operation . . 189
The large proportion of Christ's parabolic teaching devoted to the subject of work: what this teaching assumes 190
Christ's fundamental principle that of stewardship: the need of faithfulness and 'mind' work . 191
The analogy between old-world slavery and modern industrialism: an advantage of the former . 192
Christ as insistent on the duties of the employed as on the responsibilities of the employer . . 195
The temptations of the 'one-talent' man . . 195
(B) The Teaching of the Apostles: two examples:—
(1) St. James v. 4 ff. 197
A just wage must not be withheld: the parallel of the 'sweated' wage 197
The modern rage for cheapness . . . 197
(2) Ephesians vi. 5 ff. 198
The comprehensiveness and loftiness of St. Paul's teaching 198
The servant has another, besides the earthly, master 199

PAGE

The universal call to work: the method and spirit, not less important than the object, of work 199

III. *The Pastoral Relationship:*

No subject occupies a larger space in the New Testament 200

(A) Our Lord's own example and teaching . . . 200

His attitude entirely different from that of the Scribes and Pharisees 200

His recognition of the need of righteousness . . 201

The effect of clearer teaching on the doctrine of the Incarnation 202

(B) St. Paul a great ethical teacher; but his ethics based on his theology 203

His appeal through conduct to the conscience . 204

(C) The Epistles of St. James, St. Peter, and St. John are exhortations from pastors to their flocks . . 204

They are, again, ethical, but based on definite theological doctrines 205

What all these great pastors regarded as of primary importance 205

The clergy to-day must be the moral instruments of the highest moral truth and power . . . 205

IV. *The Relationship between Citizen and State:*

(A) Our Lord's Teaching: which must be drawn (*a*) from His own conduct, (*b*) from His instruction, especially upon the Kingdom of God . . 206

Christ always the strictly law-abiding citizen . . 207

This seen especially from His conduct during His trials before different legal tribunals . . 208

The narratives of these trials a revelation of good and bad citizenship 212

(B) The Teaching of Acts and the Epistles: the question bound to arise early in a very practical form 213

(1) The refusal of St. Peter and St. John to obey the Jewish rulers 213

The grounds of their refusal: the claims of a higher and more moral authority . . 213

(2) St. Paul the ideal citizen: his respect for the legal framework of society 215

PAGE

To him the civil authority the guardian of the moral virtues 216
The State the moral agent of the Moral Ruler of the Universe 217
(3) The teaching of the First Epistle of St. Peter: this belongs to a somewhat later period . 218
The relations between the Christians and the Imperial Authority now more difficult . 219
The stress laid on the highest—the Christian—standard of morality 219
The State to-day becoming indirectly a greater means for promoting the conditions of morality 220
The responsibility of the citizens, under these circumstances, for the administration of the law 221

V. *International Relationships:*
Comparatively little about these in the New Testament: the countries in which the Gospel first preached under the *Pax Romana* 222
Yet the cultivation of the 'peaceful temper' constantly enjoined 222
In the Apocalypse we hear much of the sounds of war: the conflict of spiritual forces which are the motive powers of war 223
The reign of Christ assumes international peace . . 224
Conclusion: in the New Testament the nature and quality of the Social Relationships, and so the spirit in which they are discharged, are everywhere regarded as of primary importance . . . 225

NOTES TO LECTURE III

A. Social Relationships in Tobit and Ecclesiasticus . . 226
B. Jewish Piety at the Time of the Nativity 227
C. Christ's Teaching upon the Family 227
D. Christian Ideas of Marriage and the Family . . . 228
E. Socialism, Marriage, and the Family 229
F. Preserving the Integrity of the Family 232
G. 'Father' and 'Family' (πατριὰ) in Eph. iii. 15 . . 232

PAGE

H. Intelligent Co-operation 233
I. Heb. iii. 2–6 234
J. Dr. Dale on Eph. vi. 5–9 235
K. The Practical Issues of the Doctrine of the Incarnation . 236
L. The Christian Ideal and the Work of the Clergy . . 236
M. Righteousness 240
N. The Responsibilities of Citizenship 241
O. The State as God's Minister 242
P. The Disobedience of the Apostles to the Jewish Rulers . 242
Q. State Interference 244

ADDITIONAL NOTE

The Kingdom of God and The Ideal Social State . 249

LECTURE IV

POSSIBILITIES OF REFORM

I

Survey of the ground covered in the previous lectures . . 261
The need of exact knowledge of actual conditions . . 261
The Bible and History both teach that the highest moralization of Social Relationships is essential for the welfare of society 263
Two objections: (1) The discharge of these relationships most imperfect in the 'Ages of Faith'; (2) Their discharge, in spite of Christian teaching and influences, growing worse 266
Answer: Neither in the past nor in the present has Christianity been fairly tried 266
Selfishness among the rich; the disabilities of the very poor 267
The weakness of 'socialistic' remedies 268
Is the Family utilitarian or according to a Divine archetype? 269
The first picture in the Bible, the Family; the last, the City 270
Between the two are described the efforts and failures to realize the Ideal Society 271

The Christian Faith covers all life—the personal life, the life of the citizen and the life of the man. Each least and nearest interest gains in intensity as a wider interest is acknowledged. As Christians therefore we are bound ourselves to study and, as far as we may be able, to lead others to study, the Christian ideal of our personal relations, of our class relations, of our national relations; and then to determine the next step which we can take in each direction towards it. This is the thought which I desire to master and to enforce.—BISHOP WESTCOTT.

The essence of society is moral. It is only on moral grounds that we can determine the nature and limits of its functions. The social reformer who comprehends this fact, so far from either welcoming or resisting the increase of social enterprises as a matter of course, will seek for only one supreme innovation, namely, that of *moralizing our social relations as they stand*. And the need for this is paramount. We have been teaching rights: henceforth we have by practice and precept to teach duties.—PROF. HENRY JONES.

What now seems to be needed, is that we should pay special attention to the sanctification of common social life, laying down in clear terms the moral law of Christianity and pressing its fuller observance upon the conscience of Churchmen.—BISHOP GORE.

LECTURE I

LECTURE I

PRESENT CONDITIONS

The hand of the LORD was upon me, and . . . in the visions of God brought he me into the land of Israel, and set me down upon a very high mountain, whereon was as it were the frame of a city. . . . And he brought me thither, and behold, there was a man, whose appearance was like the appearance of brass, with a line of flax in his hand, and a measuring reed; and he stood in the gate. And the man said unto me, Son of man, behold with thine eyes, and hear with thine ears, and set thine heart upon all that I shall shew thee; for to the intent that I might shew them unto thee art thou brought hither: declare all that thou seest to the house of Israel (Ezekiel xl. 1–4).

IN these lectures I wish to assert three convictions. The first is, that a more complete moralizing of all Social Relationships—that of husband and wife and of parent and child, that of employer and employed and of buyer and seller, that between pastor and flock, that between the citizen and the State, and lastly, that between one State and another—is a paramount need of the present time.

My second conviction is, that there is no moral ideal, personal or social (if these can be distinguished), other than the Christian, towards whose attainment, if we are truly wise, we shall seek to direct our

energies; also that there are no moral or spiritual forces or influences, other than those rightly termed Christian, which, if we would attain success, we shall seek to employ in order to realize this ideal. History and experience, the records of the past and the testimony of the enlightened and educated conscience in the present, are, I believe, at one in proving that true or real Christianity both expresses the highest of all moral ideals, and contains the purest and strongest of all moral forces.

My third conviction, which issues from the two previous ones, is, therefore, that the more complete moralizing of the several social relationships which I have named can only be effected through their being more completely Christianized, through their being inspired and sanctified by, through their being caused to possess, and therefore express, more of those moral qualities which are characteristic of the Divine-human nature of Christ Jesus.

I am well aware that among various peoples and at different times in the past ideals other than the Christian have been set before men as objects towards which their energies should be devoted;[1] indeed, many such ideals are being placed before us to-day.[2] I am equally aware that many influences, other than those admittedly Christian, have been

[1] That of Stoicism was one of the noblest of these.

[2] *e.g.* 'Positivism,' 'Humanism,' 'Ethical Religion,' &c.

and are still being brought to bear upon individuals and society with a so-called moral purpose. But, as I have just stated, history and experience agree in showing the insufficiency of such ideals and the inefficacy of such influences. Compared with those of true Christianity—I use the word Christian, as I shall explain later,[1] with a far longer historical connotation than is usual—compared with those of true Christianity, I contend that other ideals have proved and are proving singularly impotent to satisfy the highest aspirations of human nature, and other influences are proving equally impotent to overcome its greatest imperfections.[2]

So far as to my object. Now a word upon the method which in these lectures I purpose to follow in order to establish the correctness of these convictions. In this first lecture I shall describe, so far as I know them, the actual condition of the various social relationships which I have mentioned, in our own country at the present time. This first lecture will therefore deal with a factor of immense importance in the so-called social problem.[3] In my second lecture I shall examine, so far as time permits, what the Old Testament teaches us upon the fulfilment or discharge of these relationships. In the

[1] See pp. 94 ff., 151. [2] Note A.

[3] '*We must moralize our social relations as they stand*, and every other reform will come as a thing of course' (Professor Henry Jones, *Hibbert Journal*, vol. iv. p. 781).

third lecture I shall pursue the same course with regard to the New Testament, examining first the teaching of Christ (as recorded in the Gospels) upon these relationships, and then the teaching upon the same subject of the Apostles, whom we may regard as applying the principles of Christ to the lives of those individuals and societies for whom and in the midst of which they were working. In my last lecture, after giving a very brief summary of what may be termed the Christian philosophy of society (as this may be gathered from Holy Scripture), I shall endeavour to show how, with our increased knowledge of the nature and action of moral and spiritual forces, and with our greater powers of directing and applying these forces,[1]—both of which may be regarded as an enlargement of the content of the revealed will of God,—we may best try to meet the new needs of society which new conditions have created.

I would make just one further preliminary observation. If in what follows expressions are found which lead my hearers to think that I accept the popular conception of society as an 'organism,'[2] let me say at once that, except with strong reservations and still more important additions, such

[1] Largely due to our increased and still increasing knowledge of psychology.

[2] Note B.

an assumption would not be true. The use of analogies, while often extremely tempting, is proverbially dangerous. What, I think, may with safety be asserted is, that every society, and especially that great society we call the human race (in which every other society is comprised), does present many striking analogies to what may correctly be termed an organism; for example, in its ordinary method of development,[1] and in regard to the many connections or relations between its different parts or separate members, also in the sensitiveness of the whole or of any member to the effects of injury or want of health in any other member.

In connection with this frequently employed analogy between society and a physical organism, I may add, that if I speak of the need for the proper maintenance of the various connections of society, or of the necessity for right relationships between its different members being a matter of *vital* importance, I do not use the word 'vital' as merely a convenient superlative; I employ it in its strictest sense, and therefore by 'vital importance' I mean important to life, indeed indispensable to life.[2] The life and health of any society, as of

[1] The use of such terms as 'integration,' 'differentiation,' &c., borrowed from the exact sciences, is becoming increasingly common in works upon sociology.

[2] Cp. St. John xv. 4 ff.

any organism, depend upon the condition of the connections between all its various parts; by means of which life, in its most comprehensive sense, is conveyed between, and supplied to, all the different members. And the efficiency of each of these parts or members, in structure and in function,[1] as well as the efficiency of the whole, depends upon the vital condition of every one of these connections.

[To make the treatment of my subject as comprehensive as possible and in order to satisfy the fullest requirements of Christian teaching,[2] I might have added a survey, or at least a recognition of yet another class of relationships, namely of those existing, or those capable of existing, between the living and those whom we speak of as the dead. Much of what I have to say of the relationships between those living now must, for the fulness of our own lives, be rendered equally true of the relationships between ourselves and 'those who have gone before.' Strange as the expression in this particular connection may seem, it is yet true that, if our own individual lives and the life of society as a whole are to be what they may be and should be, this last class of relationships must also be maintained in a 'vital' condition.[3] If I do not explicitly refer to

[1] The two fields of investigation in all biological science.

[2] *e.g.* of 'The Communion of Saints.'

[3] 'There is a larger life in which we are all bound to an

these relationships, it is not that I have forgotten them, or that I underrate their importance; it is because their exclusion is demanded by the exigencies of space and time.]

My first conviction, I said, is, that the more complete moralizing of the various social relationships is a paramount, indeed an urgent need at the present time. Will anyone who has carefully studied the actually existing conditions of society venture to deny this? The pastor of a large town parish—I speak from nearly thirty years' experience in five such spheres of labour—is perpetually reminded of this need. I am speaking in an English Church containing a Font and a Communion Table, and in which the services are conducted according to the Book of Common Prayer. I may, I hope, assume that the ideals of the Prayer Book, which I believe to be the ideals of Holy Scripture, are still the ideals of the majority of English churchmen. I ask you to compare the ideals of the Prayer Book which refer to the social relationships with the actual discharge of these relationships by many of those who call themselves church people, and who would be indignant if we refused to regard them as such. Take, for instance, the Baptismal

irrevocable past; . . . a life which we inherit.' 'We are not only heirs of the past: the past lives for us in its spiritual energy' (Bishop Westcott).

and Marriage Services, and compare their ideals,[1] their teaching and exhortations, with the actual home or family life of multitudes who have used, or are prepared to use, these services. Is there not between the profession and the practice of many of these people a chasm whose breadth and depth alike seem to be extremely great?

A primary condition for effecting any kind of reform is a wide knowledge of things as they are, a clear and deep insight into actually existing conditions. The parochial clergyman has, if he will use them, exceptional opportunities of gaining this knowledge, and therefore of being able to form judgments based upon it, and especially with regard to the actual conceptions of duty and responsibility prevalent among very different classes of society. I know how fatally easy it is to generalize from wholly insufficient evidence, either of the bad or of the good; and so how unwarranted by the actual facts either a pessimistic or optimistic judgment may actually be. The widest experience is yet a limited one; and the temptation to make sweeping statements

[1] (1) In the Baptismal Service; *e.g.* that man may fight and serve on behalf of righteousness; that he may follow Christ's example; that he may 'proceed in all virtue and godliness of living,' &c.

(2) In the Marriage Service; *e.g.* that husband and wife 'may live together so long in godly love and "honesty," that they may see their children Christianly and virtuously brought up,' &c.

(especially in regard to social conditions) is one against which we need to be continually on our guard. Even at the expense of being charged with so qualifying our judgments that, at least in the opinion of the general public, they lose some measure of force, it is still far better to be content to 'speak of what we know and to testify to what we have seen.'

But we need not only a knowledge of actual conditions; just as surely we need as clear as possible an estimate of the nature and strength of the various forces or influences which have produced, and are still producing, these conditions. What these forces actually are, and how (when their effects are evil) we can counteract them by increasing the strength of contrary beneficent forces; what the nature of these other forces should be, and how we may apply them to the utmost advantage,[1] are questions which, as I shall show later, demand the most careful study.

We must now briefly survey the actual condition of the social relationships I have named and also the chief causes or tendencies—forces or influences —which we may regard as *de-moralizing* these several social relationships.

[1] It is here that we may hope so much from our growing knowledge of the 'Psychology of Society.'

I

As we contemplate the actual discharge of the home relationships, *e.g.* of husband and wife, and of parent and child to-day, we hear some people speaking of differentiation or specialization of function being an essential factor in advancing civilization. At the same time, we find other people regarding as inevitable the evil results upon family life of a commercial system in which the fierceness of competition seems yearly to grow more terrible.[1] Whatever be the source of their genesis or the cause of their diffusion, it is undoubtedly true that ideas about marriage are rapidly spreading (and issuing in conduct) which are not only contrary to the teaching of Christianity and the enlightened conscience, but of which the evil results are becoming much more widely manifest. Extremes have a tendency to meet. And to-day among the rich a selfish individualism[2] which flings aside self-restraint, and among the poor measures of socialistic legislation (apparently[3] necessary), are producing not wholly dissimilar results. On the part of the rich an individualism which refuses to recognize even the

[1] When Socialists attack marriage, this is generally the ground from which they attack it.

[2] Note C. [3] Note D.

primary social responsibilities, and on behalf of the poor a variety of socialistic measures, rendered necessary (so it is asserted) largely *through* this individualism, are, I repeat, removing from both parents and children the best and highest of all character-forming influences. Among the richest classes, mainly through the ever-increasing claims of what is termed 'society,' another word for a growing slavery, which consists in feeling compelled to do what it is the fashion to do—among the richest classes I fear that both the upbringing and the education of children are being more and more commonly delegated to various kinds of 'professional parents'; while among the poorest classes, from sheer force of 'circumstances,' much that parental responsibility and parental influence should mean is being handed over to the officials of various State institutions, and to the tender mercies of a not always wisely charitable public. I cannot enter into details, but among the most potent of these 'circumstances' of the very poor are the excessive hours and the exhausting nature of the work of those fathers (and even mothers) who are employed, and also the increasing tendency to substitute (because it is cheaper) the labour of women for that of their husbands. Only among the intermediate classes[1] of society can it be said that there still

[1] 'It would appear from the Manchester figures that the birth-

exists to any wide extent that invaluable discipline of character which is the product of a true home life; only among these classes, as a rule, are those Divinely ordained family influences for good upon manhood, womanhood, and childhood, for which there can be no substitute, being both exercised and received.

It may, I think, be asserted without fear of contradiction, that while there is no influence upon character more valuable, more truly beneficial than an honest, self-sacrificing, and persistent effort to discharge those responsibilities which we believe that God, in the Divine order of society, meant us to discharge; on the other hand, there is nothing which has a more detrimental effect upon character than the evading and shirking of these. That very many among the richer classes are shirking them, because of the measure of self-sacrifice they involve, the 'inconvenience' they entail, there

rate is highest amongst the artisan classes, and diminishes not only as we ascend, but also as we descend in the scale of social comfort' (from a recent *Report on Infantile Mortality* by Dr. James Niven).

'President Eliot, in the annual report of Harvard, 1903, gives the vital statistics of six classes more than twenty-five years out of College. They fell about 28 per cent. short of reproducing themselves. Professor Thorndike of Columbia University finds there has been a steady decline of the average number of children from 5·6 in the classes graduating 1803–1809 down to 1·8 in the classes graduating 1875–1879' (Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 275).

seems to be more than sufficient evidence.[1] But what of those almost numberless actually existing cases in which narrowness of means and other untoward circumstances render the due discharge of the family responsibilities practically impossible? May we not say that the very existence of these cases (or rather perhaps the causes of their existence) is extremely detrimental not only to the lives and characters of these people themselves, but to the life and character of the nation? It is the character which is formed in the home, the character of both parent and child, which becomes available for the wider service of the State;[2] it is the sense of responsibility acquired in the family that will be expressed in duties done for the community. But what are we actually witnessing? Do we not see at both limits of the social scale an actual inability (arising from want of proper training) to discharge efficiently those public responsibilities upon which the national welfare depends? Among the very rich and the very poor—indeed among all classes of society—we see a craving after amusement, a thirst for novelty and excitement, a devotion to sport and pleasure, which,

[1] *e.g.* from the rapidly decreasing birth-rate in these classes. (See also preceding note.)

[2] It must be remembered that the family and not the individual is the 'unit' of society, and that the State is an aggregate of families, not of individuals.

instead of the efficient discharge of the various social relationships, seems to have become the serious concern of life. It has recently been asserted [1] that 'what the richest classes have to fear, is not a demand for equality, but a demand for efficiency.' If 'in a hazardous national crisis abroad, or in some stress of economic adversity at home,' there arose a call for a 'rule of energy and intelligence,' could these classes supply it? On the other hand, what we appear to be witnessing among the electors from the proletariat is an instability of political opinion which points to an almost entire absence of political convictions. It would almost appear that in future general elections the party which wins the first few seats will stand a very good chance of obtaining a majority in Parliament. To say nothing of the demand in national *crises*, can we feel sure that when under *quite ordinary circumstances* the demand for efficient social or national service is made,—can we feel sure that such a demand can be met? As an example of what I mean take this :— Two schemes of Poor Law Reform have recently been placed before the country; the successful working of either scheme will ultimately depend, first, upon a sufficient supply of really capable

[1] C. F. G. Masterman, *The Condition of England*, p. 64. The chapter entitled 'The Conquerors,' which is certainly not written in an unkindly spirit towards the rich, deserves to be read.

administrators, secondly, upon the ability of the electors to choose such persons. What grounds have we for supposing that either condition will be satisfied? Training for usefulness and service must begin in the home; but among both rich and poor home-training at the present time seems to be strangely lacking. The rich seem to be thinking —and, perhaps unconsciously, by their personal example, seem to be teaching their children to think—only of themselves and their pleasures; the poorest, when they are not thinking of how to obtain the means of existence, are apt to indulge (sometimes from sheer weariness) in various forms of excess which prevent them thinking at all.[1] By neither the richest nor the poorest do those virtues which are essential for the making of character—self-discipline, self-sacrifice, respect for authority, foresight, daily care for the welfare of others—seem to be cultivated; hence they cannot be exercised. The purposes with which God 'setteth the solitary in families' end neither with the individual nor with the home.[2]

II

I pass to another class of social relationships—those of buyer and seller and of employer and

[1] It has been cynically said that 'the public-house is the shortest of all ways out of the slum.'

[2] Note E.

employed; though, if we regard labour and skill, time and thought, health and welfare—sometimes, alas! not only physical but moral[1] welfare—as marketable commodities, the second division is wholly unnecessary. There seems to be a growing tendency to describe this class of relationships, at least mentally, as 'simply commercial,' and to regard what is termed the 'cash *nexus*' as the all-sufficient bond of connection. There is an increasing temptation to feel satisfied that, with the payment of money and the receipt of money's worth, all the responsibilities connected with this class of relationships may begin and end.[2] This payment and receipt are more and more apt to be regarded as the sole and sufficient discharge of all the obligations of connection. I say 'apt to be regarded' because I know that still in almost numberless instances—for example, in domestic service, though even there less often than formerly—a different view is taken, and so a different relationship is maintained. There is another misconception with regard to this class of relationships which is widely, indeed, I fear, increasingly prevalent; it is to regard the interests of the two parties to the

[1] The 'moral' dangers attached to insufficient out-relief to young widows, and to insufficient wages to shop-assistants, are not unknown to social workers.

[2] In the highest sense of each the terms 'human,' 'social,' and 'Christian' may be regarded as synonymous.

relationship as *necessarily* opposed, and that each must in their own interest try to get the better of the other, or the positions of attack and defence will be reversed. The relationship is regarded as one of necessarily competing, rather than of co-operating, forces. Herein lies a source of infinite social mischief and distress to-day.[1]

Some may be inclined to regard this subject as hardly a suitable one for 'the Christian Preacher.'[2] To them I would put this question: Have you ever tried to compute how much in the Bible—in the Old Testament and in the New—is said, both explicitly and implicitly, about right and wrong relationships between buyer and seller and between master and servant?[3] In those days as in these, the tendency to regard this relationship wrongly was also widespread. Then, as now, men forgot that what is bought and sold is not only material substances but *life itself*. In those days as in these, men forgot to reckon what is called a commercial transaction (that is every purchase they made) 'in terms of life.'[4] Religion, which must include religious principles

[1] 'The honourable purchaser and the honourable seller meet in business for the fulfilment of the work of citizens. Their interest in the highest plane is the same—the right support of life' (Bishop Westcott, *Christian Social Union Addresses*, p. 63).

[2] The original designation of the Hulsean Lecturer.

[3] The many alterations in the legislation dealing with slaves is an example of this: see Hastings' *Bib. Dict.*, vol. iv. pp. 463 ff.

[4] Note F.

and influences, is meant to penetrate into, and affect, the whole of life. How, then, can it be excluded from what to multitudes of men and women is, from force of circumstances, the most extensive and engrossing of all the spheres of life?

If I may for a moment anticipate a subject upon which I shall later have much more to say, let me avow myself at once to be so far a philosophical realist as to assert, that I believe that every necessary relationship of life has not only a Divine origin, but a Divine archetype. Among these relationships I would put that between those who are engaged in providing the material needs of life—a definition which would cover a large proportion of the so-called commercial relationships to-day. Those who believe in the Incarnation believe that it has not only sanctified what we may term the material things of the universe, but also that it has thereby sanctified the callings of those who are engaged in making these available for the life of man. In the light of the Incarnation every so-called 'business' which ministers to the essential and legitimate needs of man is a 'Divine calling,'[1] and, at least ideally, should be so regarded.

I would appeal to experience, and I ask whether,

[1] Note G.

so far as we know, the so-called commercial relationships of life are actually any nearer to what we believe they should be than are the family relationships? Are they not in an even larger proportion of instances still further removed from the Christian ideal? Is it not true that very frequently there coexist two standards of conduct,[1] and that many a man who *within* his home does try, and often with a large measure of success, to put into practice Christian principles, to rule his conduct by love and tenderness, by forbearance and thoughtfulness for others —is it not true that frequently this same man, *outside* his home,—in the factory, in the warehouse, and on the stock exchange—is apt to regard other men, even women and children, at least in practice very much from the point of view of the beast of prey?[2] There is, I fear, a widespread tendency not to ask oneself, How can I work *with* others for the good of the community? but to ask oneself, How can I get out of others as much as possible for myself? How can I compel them to contribute not to my needs, but to my luxuries? How can I use them to increase my so-called wealth? I picture a man asking himself these questions; but it is rarely, I fancy, that a man asks them only *for* himself: it

[1] The danger of dividing life into, as it were, water-tight compartments should be carefully watched.

[2] Note H.

is rather on behalf of those dependent upon him —his wife, his sons, his daughters—that he asks them. It is rather that these may live in a certain style, that they may mix with others upon the same level of material comfort or rather luxury; it is that they may enjoy what are termed 'social advantages' that the father or the husband is constantly guilty of the most unsocial conduct towards others.[1] Yet how many of the wives and daughters of the rich ever pause to consider the cost in human life, in human want and suffering, even in human sin, at which their pleasures and luxuries are being obtained? And this is not the case merely with the rich; it is even more so with those who, with moderate incomes, attempt in external things to copy and vie with those richer than themselves.[2] To do this means that they must have what they want; although they are quite unable to pay a just price for it. Yet so great is competition to-day, that a demand for goods at a price at which it is all but impossible to produce them will be met by a supply.

I speak of a man regarding his fellow-men and women from the point of view of 'a beast of prey.'

[1] See description of a case in Clementina Black's *Sweated Industry*, pp. 169 f. Of the employer she writes, 'He was committing a daily robbery upon people too weak to withstand his demands . . . his course was attended with much more suffering to others than that of any highwayman.'

[2] Note I.

Do not think the simile too strong: not only does St. Paul use it,[1] but he shows the inevitable issues of conduct governed by this motive. It is these very issues from which we are suffering to-day. Men not only 'bite and devour one another,' they are actually being 'consumed by one another.' It is the appalling and wholly needless consumption of life, indeed the wanton destruction of life, which is the saddest result of our present commercial relationships.[2] It is to prevent this destruction of life, which is so entirely contrary to the Saviour's declared purpose,[3] that the Christian social reformer constantly interferes. It is the call to do everything in his power to abolish this awful destruction of life—an inevitable result of a system in which man is fighting against man for the possibility of existence—which inspires the Christian prophet to-day. It is identically the same call which inspired Amos and Micah[4] to warn men of what cannot be averted when they forget the 'Law of the LORD,' the law whose first commandment is to worship only the God of Righteousness and Justice, and whose second commandment is to love their neighbours as themselves.

[1] Gal. v. 15.

[2] 'Competitive commerce pits men against one another in a gladiatorial game in which there is no mercy and in which ninety per cent. of the combatants finally strew the arena' (Rauschenbusch).

[3] St. John x. 10.

[4] Amos ii. 4 ff; Micah iii. 1 ff.

Only upon the constant cultivation, and the daily mutual exercise of the highest and purest moral virtues, which are the essential qualities of the Divine Nature itself, and which were expressed in the historic life of Him who declared His oneness [1] with the Father,—only upon these can a permanent condition of social welfare be established.

If you would get a clear grasp of the wholly unnecessary destruction of human life going on at the present time, you may compare the death-rate of the 'slum' districts of such cities as London,[2] Manchester, Liverpool, or Leeds with the death-rate of their best residential suburbs. And when you read these tables—mere prosaic figures—you must be careful to exercise your imagination. You must think of the suffering—often extending over months, even years, of ill-health—by which many of these unnecessary deaths have been preceded. You must also think of the anxiety and sorrow and further privation—all detractors from life—which this suffering has entailed. I speak, as I said I would speak, of what I know. In the last six years I have spent more than a thousand hours in the various wards of a large general hospital. There I have seen far more suffering and sickness, which

[1] St. John x. 30; xiv. 10.

[2] The far greater space devoted to sickness among the poor in the Poor Law Report of 1909, compared with that of 1834, shows how the public conscience is awakening on this subject.

ought never to have come into existence, than I care to contemplate.[1] Had our social relationships been more perfectly moralized, that is, more perfectly Christianized, by far the greater part of this suffering might have been prevented.

Consider the comparative ravages simply of phthisis among the poor and among the well-to-do. The disease is, of course, bacterial in origin, but its propagation and its effects are largely due to unhealthy and overcrowded dwellings, to insufficient food, and to various insanitary conditions amid which work is done; though this last evil is now far less than what it was.[2] All these are causes of a low state of vitality, upon which the seeds of the disease fasten themselves.[3] But who has actually *profited* by these unhealthy dwellings, by this insufficient food, and by these insanitary conditions of employment? It does not do to inquire too closely into the indirect means by which many fortunes have been, and still are being, made. It is certainly well for the peace of mind of those who enjoy them[4] that they rarely are aware of the exact nature of these means.[5]

[1] In 1908 the death-rate for Bermondsey was 18·75 per 1000; for Hampstead it was 8·48.

[2] Still even now the 'inspection' of places of work leaves much to be desired.

[3] Note J.

[4] *e.g.* the wives and daughters of those who have made them.

[5] In the *Report on Physical Deterioration* (Cd. 2175, 1904),

To-day, I believe, that the most thoughtful among both employers and employed are growing more and more dissatisfied with certain conditions under which, so we are often told, trade 'has to be' carried on. Among practically all earnest and intelligent social workers this is certainly the case.[1] From 'force of circumstances' the relationship between employer and employed has become more and more dis-humanized; and to dis-humanize a relationship is to 'de-socialize' it and to unmoralize it. The workers have become 'hands,' and a large proportion of employers have ceased to have any personal connection with most of those whom they employ.[2] For a long time we have been zealously engaged in perfecting machinery which already has done so much, and I suppose will yet do so much more, for man; and under the term machinery we may include organization (a part of which is careful differentiation of function)—that complicated organization of which our modern world is so full. But 'have we been mindful of the difficulty of doing anything for a man without making him

some very striking evidence upon Local Administration and insanitary conditions is disclosed (pp. 21 ff.). See also Additional Note, pp. 81 ff.

[1] Note K.

[2] Instead of the two classes living more or less together, the employers in our large towns now live together in one district (the 'suburb'), whereas the workers are herded together in another district (the 'slum').

less a man by the act?' To-day man, instead of being the master of machinery, has become to a great extent a part of it, if not its slave. The individual has become a tiny cog in a vast and intricate mechanism ever revolving with increasing speed. As a tiny cog-wheel he wears out, and is then thrown out upon the great human scrap heap.[1]

I am not content to ask what is, or what should be, the social or moral relationship between the employer and the workman who has been discharged (I do not here refer to the drunkard, or the slacker, or the hopelessly inefficient, but to the man discharged through the exigencies of trade); I go behind this question and I ask, What is the social or moral responsibility of the community towards this man who is unemployed, not by the will of his employer, but, to a great extent, in order that the community (of which you and I are members) may purchase what it desires at the lowest possible price? Regarded from a wider point of view the question is that of the moral and social *responsibility* of the community to all its members.[2] Ideally, employer and employed should alike be regarded as working together, as co-operating, for the common good. If

[1] Note L.

[2] This is the true argument in favour of a national subsidy towards Unemployment Insurance and Old Age Pensions.

we rise yet a step higher, and, as I have said, regard everyday business as a Divine calling—and there are both employers and employed who so regard it—then those who are working together to supply the needs of men may be regarded as working together to further the purpose of God. They are therefore 'workers together,' not only for Him, but with Him.[1] This is the true ideal at which we must aim, and which will be realized only by the moralization, that is by the Christianizing (according to the teaching of St. Paul) of their social relationship.

There is one issue of the problem which we have all too frequently witnessed of late years—a strong combination of employers on one side opposed to a strong combination of employed on the other side,[2] and who have been likened to two contending armies, each occupying a strongly entrenched camp, each fearful of the other, each ready to make an aggressive movement, or ready to meet such a movement when made by the other side. But when we see these combinations of forces opposite to each other, we do not by any means see all that exists. What of the fatal weakness to each side caused by

[1] 2 Cor. vi. 1. 'Our secular work is just of the same kind as a great part of God's work. Lay a firm hold of this truth, and see how it affects every kind of secular business' (R. W. Dale).

[2] Masters' Associations *v.* Trades Unions.

traitors *within* each camp? If it were not for the presence of these—really the most immoral and utterly unchristian, because utterly selfish, factors in the problem—we might hope that the very principle of co-operation or combination on the part of each might ultimately lead to co-operation between the two.[1] The worst foe of the employer who would be just to his workpeople is his unscrupulous fellow-employer who, for the sake of private gain, is cutting prices and trying to undersell him. The worst enemies of those workmen who, by the principle of combination (when legitimately employed), are seeking to improve the condition of their class, are, first, the selfish workmen, the so-called blacklegs, who will not pay their subscription to their union; and, secondly, the helpless sweated workwomen who too often are the unconscious tools of the unscrupulous employer.[2] A wider application of the truly Christian principle of co-operation, involving both trustfulness and trustworthiness, would go far to solve many of the difficulties from which we are suffering, and at the root of which lies too often a selfish individualism, which thinks only of personal

[1] A common argument for Socialism to-day is the success of 'Trusts' and other trade combinations.

[2] What Trades Unions and trade organization have done for the Lancashire cotton industry is well known. The State will now intervene to protect the worst-paid class of workers in certain scheduled trades.

and private advantage. It is difficulties such as these—together with a short-sighted international competition, for 'He hath made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth'[1] —which to-day hamper the efforts of both the well-intentioned employer and the well-intentioned workman.

There is one great principle, sometimes called the 'cosmic' principle, which seems to be at work throughout the organic world, and which it appears that some, in practice if not in theory, would wish to see applied without reserve in every sphere of human life and conduct. This principle is sometimes also described as that of 'the survival of the fittest.' But when we reach the world of man 'the cosmic principle' too often seems to mean simply the survival of 'the physically strongest or of the morally most unscrupulous.'[2] The principle, however, unless stated with very large qualifications, is really inapplicable to man, because it takes no account of the highest and most essential factors of human nature. It knows nothing of the ethical. And, read in the light of our fuller knowledge of the New Testament, a large part of the teaching

[1] Acts xvii. 26. One of the objects of the so-called 'Red-International'—a world-wide socialist movement—is to check international competition.

[2] Note M.

and work of Christ will be seen to have consisted in combating its effects. Take this description of His method: 'A bruised reed shall He not break, and smoking flax shall He not quench, till He send forth judgment unto victory, and in His name shall the Gentiles hope.'[1] If we accept the Greek rendering of Isaiah, which substitutes 'unto truth' for 'unto victory,' and if 'truth,' as so often, may imply the ideal, and also if 'judgment' may be interpreted to mean acceptance by the enlightened conscience of the method (or direction) of the Servant of the Lord, then we have here a very striking prophecy of the ultimate success of those social reformers who are striving to obtain practical acceptance of the principles of Christ. Once more, in the words of the Greek translator, 'In His name shall nations hope,' may we not see a conviction that in the qualification of the social relationships by the qualities of Christ's character, in the Christianizing of those relationships, lies the hope of welfare for every nation?

Unfortunately during the last century the cosmic principle—here sadly too often implying the survival of the least scrupulous—was widely accepted in practice in the sphere of trade. Is not this the fundamental principle of the so-called Manchester School of political economists?

[1] Isa. xlii. 3–4; St. Matt. xii. 20–21.

Certainly we may believe that by many the principle was admitted before its inevitable issues were discerned. It was forgotten that, while the principle does undoubtedly apply to the lower, the animal nature of man, one of the chief ends of life is the conquest of that lower nature by a higher. In this conquest there must therefore rule a higher principle than the so-called cosmic one.

III

The next relationship demanding our consideration is that between the Christian minister and his flock, between the pastor and those over whom he has been called to exercise oversight, and towards whom, therefore, his responsibility must be great.[1] I do not forget that the people have also a responsibility towards one called to exercise the ministerial function, but to this audience a consideration of the subject from the first point of view may be regarded as the most important. Let me remind you of the following words of Dr. Hort: 'We are apt to forget (1) that according to the New Testament the Christian life is the true human life, and that Christians become true men in proportion as they live up to it; (2) that the right relations between

[1] Note N.

the members of the Christian society or *Ecclesia* are simply the normal relations which should subsist between members of the human race; and therefore (3) that all relations of life, being baptized into Christ, become parts and particular modes of Christian membership, and can be rightly acted out only under its conditions, *while Christian fellowship further creates a bond*, independent of the ordinary family and other such relations, *which has a peculiar sacredness of its own.*'[1] Put into other words, definitely Christian relationships, of which that of the pastor towards his flock must surely be the chief, exercised in a definitely Christian 'purposive' society, should be a model for all other relationships; they should influence all other relationships for good. Let me appeal to experience. Can you not think of both town and country parishes in which the relationships between the people themselves have been largely influenced by the nature of the relationship between the pastor and his people? We may speak of this relationship as 'spiritual'; I prefer to speak of it as truly human but sanctified by the Holy Spirit of God, the true and only really *uniting* Spirit. Where this human relationship, thoroughly sanctified by the Holy Spirit, exists, where it is suffused and permeated and ruled

[1] Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 228 (the italics are my own).

by those moral qualities which we associate with the character of Christ,[1] there we have a strong and widespread influence for good.

I will not ask whether the relationship between pastor and people to-day is usually what it should be. I would no more ask sweeping questions than I would indulge in general and unqualified statements. But I will ask, Whether it might not often be more fully *moralized?* In many respects in the great majority of cases the pastoral relationship is, I believe, far more nearly what it should be than was the case fifty years ago. The careless pastor is surely far less common now than then. To bring our consideration of this particular relationship as close as possible to my thesis I would ask, Is there not, however, a need in many instances for the relationship between the Christian minister and those among whom he ministers being more broadly *humanized*, and in that respect being more thoroughly Christianized? Contrast the relationship of Christ to the people with that of the Pharisees to them, and is not our Lord's relation to those around Him infinitely the more human? How can this more perfect humanizing be effected but by the pastor himself being more filled with the great human interests and the moral qualities of Christ? How,

[1] We must remember ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν· 2 Cor. iii. 17.

but by his objects being made more directly those of Christ?[1]

To live together, to work together for the same object, to think alike so as to hold the same objects to be of the same proportionate importance,—each of these conditions marks an ascending step in closeness of relationship. The people judge the minister's real objects by his conduct; and in the conduct of the minister speech, by which he gives utterance to estimates of value,[2] is a most important factor. We may therefore ask, Whether in his teaching sufficient stress is frequently laid upon those particular objects which we believe to have been nearest to the heart of Christ? The dangers of professionalism are always great, and possibly to-day they are growing greater.[3] The temptation to rely upon authority and especially upon official position seems to be increasing. That which is apt to loom large in the eye of the professional mind may actually be of small intrinsic importance. It is with the supply of the deepest needs of human nature that the clergy are charged. The shape or the colour of a vestment, the use or not of an

[1] Note O.

[2] The tremendous importance of correct value judgments is not always realized.

[3] There is an interesting chapter on the 'Development of Class Attributes,' among the clergy, in Whittuck's *The Church of England and Recent Religious Thought*, pp. 20 ff.

ornament or accessory of worship, a particular posture or gesture, may to the official mind —especially when associated with memories of historic continuity, or with some far-reaching, but hardly immediately applicable, doctrinal implication—seem to be of great importance. Are these things so regarded by the majority of earnest lay people? And in these matters may not the lay mind, through the advantage of detachment, take a more true estimate of value than the average clerical mind? Are such things really of importance when compared with the helps and the influences which many (often unconsciously to themselves) so sorely need—knowledge of the right and courage to do it, power to overcome temptation, sympathy in distress, encouragement to greater personal purity and temperance, more real kindliness of heart, more perfect justice in dealing with others? In this connection the following words of Dean Church may well be remembered:—'What agony will' [at the Day of Judgment] 'surely pass through the heart of all who, by any fault in their religion, by undervaluing for any cause the great natural virtues which all men reverence, of truth, and justice, and generosity, by any selfishness and narrowness which they have imported into their personal religion, by the pettiness and bitterness of their contentions, by their

want of sympathy and breadth of soul, by their scorn of self-discipline and self-command, by obstinately insisting on their own will and opinion have "perverted that which was right" and have caused "the way of truth to be evil spoken of," and "the name of God" to be "blasphemed."'[1]

I must not pursue this subject any further now, for it will naturally occupy a large place in our attention when we come to consider social relationships in the light of the teaching of both the Old and the New Testaments. All I would add here is, that I believe that among the most urgent needs of the present time is a more direct moralizing, in other words a more complete Christianizing of the personal relationship between the minister and his people, that is of his influence upon them. I speak with all humility when I say that the season does seem to have arrived when judgment, that is a worthier estimate of comparative values, should in this matter begin at the house of God.

IV

The next relationship to which I would draw attention is that between the citizen and the State and between the State and the citizen. To-day

[1] R. W. Church, *Cathedral and University Sermons*, p. 292.

we are living amid a perfect babel of confused voices, of warring theories, of antagonistic conceptions (at least on the surface) as to the nature and the proper limits of this particular relationship.[1] Hence it behoves us to try to think with special clearness and to speak with every care. May I also add that this is a subject to which, it seems to me, English Churchmen should pay particular heed, and for this reason, that when we consider the relative number of Churchmen and Nonconformists, and the relative opportunities which they have of serving the community,—opportunities due to wealth, social position, education, and leisure, I doubt whether we can affirm that Churchmen have shown an equal public spirit, an equal readiness to take up the burden with their Nonconformist brethren. I do not here allude to the comparatively few positions of national influence and importance, I refer rather to the immense and growing number of positions—sometimes, but wrongly, regarded as of little importance—upon municipal, district, and parish councils and upon Boards of Guardians. The importance of such positions, if judged by the responsible nature of their work and the opportunities of useful service which they offer, is really very great.

[1] This is, of course, the battle-ground of Socialism and of so-called 'Socialistic Legislation.' See Note P.

I would plead for the most careful consideration of the relationship before us—that of the citizen to the State,—because I believe it is quite impossible to exaggerate the immensity of the issues, which in the immediate, and in the more remote, future depend upon a humble, pure, just, and intelligent conception of the meaning, and so of the responsibilities, of citizenship.[1] What evidence have we that such a conception is at all general? Have we not recently in more than one or two instances had very painful disclosures of a want of both purity and intelligence in those elected to administer the law? To-day some of those who based high hopes upon the coming of the democracy to power are confessing more than a measure of disappointment.[2] What seems to be chiefly wanting is an adequate sense of responsibility. Take a recent striking instance. Most of those who are intimately acquainted with present social conditions expected that the Report of the Poor Law Commission would reveal serious imperfections in that important branch of the public service. But were they prepared for all that has been revealed? Were they quite prepared for the sweeping condemnation (based upon facts now in process of being made public) passed, though in different measure and for different reasons, by both the Majority and the Minority of the Commission upon

[1] Note Q. [2] Note R.

the administration of the law? While differing as to the source of the blame to be passed upon the administrators themselves, the two sections of the Commission are at one in condemning the actual administration. This revelation is a proof of what I have just asserted—a widely spread, hopelessly inadequate conception of civic responsibility. The people have shown this in their choice of the class of men they put into office. The majority of the Guardians both before and after election seem to have shown little or no sense of responsibility to fit themselves to discharge their duties intelligently.[1] As one proof of the want of a sense of responsibility among the people, we must remember that at the last election of Guardians in London only 28 per cent. of the electors took the trouble to record their votes! To-day we are told that power lies with the people. But together with power there must go responsibility. We cannot retain the one without discharging the other. History teaches us quite certainly that power inevitably passes away from those who show no sense of responsibility in its due exercise. What evidence have we that an adequate civic responsibility is at all generally recognized to-day? This

[1] It may with some degree of truth be retorted that the responsibilities of Guardians to-day are so varied that it is impossible for one man to have a satisfactory knowledge of them all: this is one of the strongest arguments for the 'Minority' scheme of 'devolution' (see *the Report* itself, pp. 101 ff.).

question has recently been asked, For what do the people, and by the people we mean 80 per cent. of the inhabitants of these islands, really care? About what are they thinking? Do they give any proofs that they are, as a body, taking an intelligent interest in the welfare of the State? To-day the men read, more than anything else, the halfpenny local newspaper. In most of these papers the very meagrest, if any, report of the proceedings of Parliament is chronicled. The proprietors naturally print what interests the public. What do they publish but columns of news relating to sport, and edition after edition giving the latest cricket or football scores and the latest odds upon a race-horse's chance of success? The conduct of tens of thousands of English citizens to-day bears a strong resemblance to the conduct attributed by tradition to Nero during the conflagration of Rome.

But there comes a season when the people are called upon to make a choice of policies, and also a choice of leaders to carry these out. Upon what, by the great majority, is this choice based? Is it based upon a carefully reasoned estimate of services rendered in the past, of needs which should be supplied in the present and immediate future, and of the comparative fitness of rival candidates to undertake and carry out the work which should be done? Actually, does not this choice seem to be more and

more ruled by some temporary excitement, and to be based upon a fickleness whose origin it is difficult to attribute to anything else than a mere love of change?

Besides this apathy, alternating with brief periods of excitement, two other influences detrimental to the public welfare must be considered. The first is 'party spirit'—a very different thing from a well-reasoned party loyalty arising from a recognized necessity for sinking minor personal predilections which do not affect the conscience. To-day at certain times and in certain quarters (in Church as well as in State) party spirit not only runs high, it sometimes actually blinds our eyes to far more important considerations. This arises, in a measure at least, from want of a wide outlook, from lack of a sufficient knowledge of all the factors, and from carelessness in considering all the various possible issues of a problem.

The other danger lies in men seeking office from a secondary motive. Unfortunately there are men who are prepared to serve the community for their own advantage.[1] So far this evil has not entered into English public life either so widely or so deeply as it has into the public life of some other countries. Still, of recent years there have not been wanting ominous signs that the evil does exist; therefore its

[1] Cp. 2 Kings xvii. 33.

development needs to be carefully watched. Such a relationship to the community is entirely immoral; it is also utterly unchristian. It lacks the first principle of Christian service, that of self-sacrifice for others.

As I deal with this part of my subject you may again be fearing that I have forgotten that I am speaking from the pulpit of a Christian church. I have not, however, forgotten the Hebrew prophets, 'For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until righteousness go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth.'[1] I have not forgotten the opposite picture, 'Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that doeth justly, that seeketh truth,'[2] or, 'There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth, neither is there any that taketh her by the hand of all the sons that she hath brought up.'[3] In these passages is revealed a prolific source of national disaster.

[1] Isa. lxii. 1 f. This verse (from the meaning of righteousness, *i.e.* right, and salvation, *i.e.* victory) doubtless refers to God's *vindication* of His people; but this must depend on their fitness for this vindication. The patriotism of the Hebrew prophet was not of that kind which cries, 'My country, right or wrong!'

[2] Jer. v. 1.

[3] Isa. li. 18. In Mazzini's *The Duties of Man* there is a noble chapter, entitled 'God,' on the religious inspiration of patriotism and reform.

If there is need of a deeper sense of responsibility on the part of the individual towards the community, and of a more efficient discharge of his responsibilities towards it, the corresponding duty of the community towards its individual members must not be forgotten. This must surely be interpreted as the personal responsibility of each to see that he in his capacity, as a part of the community, does all in his power to see that the community discharges its responsibilities towards each individual. May it not be expressed thus: As individuals we must choose such representatives as we believe will frame good and useful laws, as members of the community we must see that such laws are duly administered for the highest benefit of each individual citizen? Of one change which is coming over many of our English communities to-day we may speak hopefully. The doctrine that the State has a very real responsibility towards its individual citizens is not only more widely accepted in theory, it is being more generally applied in practice. If only people would regard national or municipal institutions as co-operative undertakings for the benefit of *all* citizens, we might see a rapid growth of such institutions accompanied by a very profitable expenditure for the good of all. Only here individual responsibility must not be forgotten. The responsibility of the State towards the individual can only be adequately discharged where

and when each individual so discharges his duty to the State.[1] We must not cease to insist upon this fundamental truth—that every community finally exists for the individuals who compose it.[2] Yet too many still interpret this principle thus: 'Society exists for me,' whereas it should be interpreted: 'Society exists for everyone else as well as me.' The first interpretation is not only altogether unchristian, it is the primary source of all social evil. For the second interpretation Christ became incarnate, suffered, and died.

V

The last relationship upon which I would speak is that of State to State, of nation to nation. For several reasons this is a subject of special anxiety at the present time. It is one demanding not only the most careful consideration, but unceasing, earnest prayer. Nearly sixty years ago, on a celebrated, an international occasion,[3] a hope, indeed more than a hope, was expressed that the day of wars between civilized nations was over. The histories of Europe, Asia, Africa, and America have all since then shown how little that hope was justified. While certain old sources of international rivalry and conflict may

[1] Note S. [2] Note T.

[3] At the opening of the Great Exhibition of 1851.

GOSHEN COLLEGE LIBRARY

have disappeared, new and not less dangerous causes have appeared; indeed, within the last few years some of these seem to have grown actually stronger.[1]

We may surely assume that the relationships between nations, which are composed of human beings, must be moral:[2] there is no reason why relationships between large aggregates of men should be less moral than those between individuals and families. This being so, we who profess to be Christians must not rest until international relationships become Christianized, that is perfectly and completely moralized. The causes of war must be immoral; for war can only occur when international relationships are wrong. This does not imply that to take part in war, even to make war, is necessarily wrong. Not only a defensive war, but a war on behalf of the oppressed may be one of the most supreme of all duties. It is aggrandizement, it is lust or cruelty or oppression, it is not the combating of these that is wrong. If we look back over, say, the last half-century, who would venture to assert that if those nations who have provoked the various wars which in it have occurred had been thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Christianity—who would venture to assert that then any one of these wars might not have been prevented? The final responsibility for war may seem to rest with rulers or statesmen, but

[1] Note U. [2] Note V.

the motive power is generally due to the spirit of the people.[1] War may seem to break out with the suddenness of a volcanic eruption, but the spirit which causes it is not the growth of a day or a year; neither is the peaceful temper, which is the best of all safeguards against it. It was a true instinct which associated the pursuit of peace with that of sanctification,[2]—the essential condition for the realization of the presence of God; and also with the obligation to constant watchfulness, lest there be a moral cause of separation from Him Who is the Author of peace; and finally, with the warning that it is a root of bitterness, a poisonous influence, probably here that of an unmoralized personality or character, which spreads corruption through society.

There are two causes of war which modern conditions seem to have rendered particularly dangerous: both are utterly unchristian and unsocial; both need to be most carefully watched. Both, however, are so entirely wicked that, had we not a deep knowledge of the possibilities of evil in human nature, we might be tempted to doubt their existence. Unfortunately war, while it means an incalculable loss to the community, does generally mean immense gain to certain individuals. It has before now meant the making of great private

[1] Note U. [2] Heb. xii. 14.

fortunes. The first cause to which I refer is the spread of inflammatory printed matter, by means of which an irresponsible journalism seeks to obtain a wide market for its pernicious wares; the second, another example of wicked cupidity, is the spirit which animates the financier (of whom the irresponsible journalist is too often the tool) who would take advantage of exceptional national needs. It behoves the community always to remember that there do exist men who hope to benefit by war, and who, therefore, are engaged in fostering and spreading the spirit which results in war. St. James asked: 'Whence come wars and whence come fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your pleasures' (which can be purchased by wealth) 'that war in your members?'[1] There are men living in pleasure to-day on immense wealth which has been to a large extent made through taking advantage of a state of war. A national extremity has been their opportunity. Had there been neither gold nor diamonds in South Africa, the poor in England might have been better off than what they are to-day. This we must remember, that war largely depends upon public opinion, and that public opinion is ultimately an aggregate of a multitude of private opinions. The ideal relationship of State to State will only issue from the ideal relationship of its

[1] St. James iv. 1 ff.

citizens towards either State. Where these are really Christian the causes of war can hardly arise.

I have now considered the actual present conditions of five social relationships—those of the family and home, those of the world of commerce, those within the Church, that of the citizen to the State, and, lastly, that of one State or nation to another. In each of these relationships human nature is both instrument and object; it is both means and end. It is through man as well as for man that each relationship exists. Therefore upon the nature of man—as it is and as it may be—will depend the nature of each relationship, also its possibilities: not, however, upon man as an individual, but upon man as a *socius*,[1] that is as a being endowed with social capacities and social faculties, charged also with social responsibilities. Upon what does the satisfaction of these capacities, the development of these faculties, the discharge of these responsibilities depend? It depends upon the cultivation and exercise of those highest qualities of which human nature is capable, those moral virtues expressed in the life of the Perfect Man—the essential virtues, the characteristic qualities of Jesus, Who is the Christ.

[1] Giddings, *Inductive Sociology*, pp. 9–10.

NOTES TO LECTURE I

NOTE A. *Substitutes for Christianity.* Instructive evidence of the effects of these will be found in the second volume of *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools* (Longmans), *e.g.*:

(1) Pp. 43 ff. 'The main defect of the French moral instruction is that it has no vista, no escape into the ideal and the infinite . . . it is too obvious, too familiar; often too commonplace and too trivial. It is lacking in the subtler delicacies, the more solemn sanctities, and in appeals to the deeper needs of self-devotion. It does not open up the large horizons which alone make possible profound transformations of character: the solemn chords of the human soul are not struck,' &c.

(2) Pp. 317 f. 'Religious teaching is forbidden in all New Zealand schools; moral instruction is required. . . . The results can hardly be said to be anything but disastrous. . . . The gradual dying out of the instinct of worship is admitted by all and regretted by most. It is true that the general high character of the schools is imparting an external culture and an intellectual knowledge of the higher ideals of life to their pupils; but that this, however much to be esteemed in itself, rests upon no permanent foundation, and is unable to bear the struggle of life, is proved *inter alia* by the enormous growth of every kind of gambling, and by the constant and portentous increase of sexual offences, even in very young children, which, while it certainly is not caused by the system of secular education, is equally certainly in no sense hindered by it.'

NOTE B. *Society as an 'Organism.'* On this much-debated question Professor Giddings writes: 'In Mr. Spencer's system of "Synthetic Philosophy" the principles of sociology are derived from principles of biology and psychology. Social development is regarded as a super-organic evolution. It is a system in which all the organic and psychic phenomena of human life are combined in larger forms of intricate yet orderly complexity . . . society is an organism, not in mere fanciful analogy . . . but really; and not morally only, but physiologically as well, because in its constitution there is a division of labour that extends beyond individuals to groups and organizations of individuals. There is a sustaining system, made up of industrial groups; a distributing system, made up of commercial activities; and a regulating system, made up of political and religious agencies' (*Principles of Sociology*, p. 8).

In the final chapter of the same book (p. 420 f.) Professor Giddings writes: 'Is [society], as Mr. Spencer and others have said, an organism? Certainly it is not a physical organism. . . . If society is an organism at all, it must be described as physio-psychic—as a psychical organism essentially, but with a physical basis.' Professor Giddings' own opinion is that 'a society is more than an organism—it is something as much higher and more complex than an organism, as an organism is higher and more complex than inorganic matter. A society is an *organization*, partly a product of unconscious evolution, partly a result of conscious planning.' He proceeds: 'Like an organism, an organization may have a function. The function of society is to develop conscious life and to create human personality.'

In Professor Mackenzie's *Introduction to Social*

Philosophy, the subject is dealt with at considerable length. He defines 'an organic system' as 'one in which the parts are intrinsically related to the whole, in which there is development from within, and in which there is a reference to an inner end'; and then he shows that a society answers to all these conditions. From this he considers that we are justified in believing that 'society is more nearly analogous to an organic whole than to any other form of unity' (p. 159). But, apparently, he too regards society rather as an organization. For, as he says, 'the point at which the analogy [with the animal organism] is in particular seen to fail is in considering the independence of the individual consciousness. . . . Society is a "discreet unity." Each individual has the shaping of his life to a great extent in his own control; and there is no visible system in which the place of the individual is determined, and by which his acts are regulated, as the parts of an organism are regulated by the central organs. The individual is in many ways independent of society, and he may even set himself in opposition to it. It is the prerogative of every man to say "I"—and to write it with a capital' (p. 138).

There is also a useful discussion of the idea of the 'social organism,' and especially of Leslie Stephen's use of it, in Seth's *Ethical Principles* (pp. 105 ff.).

NOTE C. '*Individualism*' (in the sense of effort towards abolishing the need for all kinds of self-restraint). Three evidences of this are: (1) The rapid increase in the number of divorces (and among the poor of separation orders); (2) The diminution of the birth-rate, especially among the richer classes; (3) Handing over almost the

entire charge of children to servants, governesses, and the masters of preparatory schools.

(1) 'In 1907 there were 623 divorce cases in which decrees were made absolute in the High Court.' 'The annual average number of separation orders made between 1903 and 1907 was 6,959.' 'Of 631 cases [of divorce] disposed of in the High Court in London, 502 were entered as undefended (*statements by Lord Justice Gorrell in the House of Lords, July* 14, 1909). 'Facilities for divorce have so increased in the United States that now decrees are granted annually to the number of 72,000' (*the Archbishop of Canterbury on the same date*). [In 1867 the number was 9,937, in 1886 it was 29,535.] Upon divorce in the United States see Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, pp. 129 ff.; also Hobhouse, *Morals in Evolution*, vol. i. pp. 234 ff. While the increase in the population of the United States in the last ten years has been twenty per cent., the increase of divorces has been sixty-six per cent.[1]

(2) According to the tables of 1906, nearly forty per cent. of the divorcees in the United States had no children, twenty-three per cent. had only one; two per cent. only had large families.

(3) 'My own profession constantly brings before me instances of an immorality . . . which has most disastrous consequences. . . . I mean the habit which fathers have of delegating altogether to others the education of their children . . . they become guilty of a neglect the immediate consequences of which are sometimes startling,

[1] There are also two valuable pamphlets in vol. ii. of the *Pan-Anglican Papers*: the first on 'The Sanctity of Marriage as the basis of Human Society' (J. H. F. Peile), and the second, 'The Sanctity of Marriage' (by Bishop Doane).

and the less direct and obvious consequences beyond calculation. . . . The father hands over to others the child's education, his mind, his soul. . . . I know scarcely any cause from which the community suffers so much . . . consider the effect upon the parent himself; there is no task which life brings with it, at least to the average man, calculated to raise him so much as the task of educating his own children,' &c. (Sir John Seeley, *Lectures and Addresses*, pp. 294 ff.). [If this is the case with the father, what must it be with the mother?]

NOTE D. *Removal of Parental Responsibility among the Poor.* Upon few subjects connected with the Social Problem is there, at the present time, even among actual workers among the poor, a greater division of opinion than upon this. Upon one point, however, among almost all intelligent social workers of wide experience—with the exception, of course, of the extreme, the so-called 'scientific' socialists—there is practically unanimity of opinion, viz. as to the immense value of the family, and that, even as an instrument of social reform and progress, we should do all in our power to strengthen it, to develop family feeling, and to encourage the discharge of family responsibilities. It is upon the methods to be pursued to attain these ends that such strong differences of opinion exist. One view is that which may be regarded as generally held by those who support the principles of the Charity Organization Society, and which is expressed by Mrs. Bosanquet when she writes: 'We find the family weak and perverted wherever there is a reliance upon external sources of maintenance. It is as if the man in abdicating from his economic independence inflicts an injury upon his moral

nature which poisons all his natural relations' (*The Family*, p. 339). The other view is excellently and most temperately advocated by Mr. R. A. Bray in *The Town Child*, in the section, 'The Relation to the Family,' pp. 303 ff., where he shows clearly that a measure of State aid, far from destroying the sense of responsibility in the poorest parents, and far from encouraging them to neglect their children, will have the very opposite effect. His argument is that, 'if the struggle to maintain the family is too exacting, either the struggle will cease and the family as a unit disappear, or the struggle will go on, because it is the least of many evils, but the sentiment of family affection will be quenched and its place will be taken by a sense of weariness or a feeling of active irritation at the harassing ties involved.' His comparison of the ordinary day of the very poor and of the well-to-do mother (pp. 310 ff.) should be read. He believes that 'a minimum wage, improved housing conditions, State maintenance of widows, municipal schools, municipal dinners, municipal wash-houses, municipal playing-fields—the adoption of each or all of these proposals will add to and not detract from the vigour of the family. It is no doubt true, that if the State were to assume all the duties of the parent, the family relation, as such, would disappear. But there is at the present time a very large margin of safety, where the State may interfere with altogether beneficent result' (p. 314).

A somewhat similar view, with possibly greater reservations, is taken by Professor Henry Jones in 'The Working Faith of the Social Reformer' (*Hibbert Journal*, vol. iv. p. 313): 'I believe the dangers of lowering the sense of parental responsibility among the poor are exaggerated. The obligations of parents will

not be loosened on the hearths of the respectable poor by any State regulations. . . . The children of the poor are not made over to the care of nurses, nor sent from home in order to be educated. . . . On the other hand, where the obligations of the parents are easily loosened it seems to be time for the State to interfere on behalf of its coming citizens.'

NOTE E. *The Home as a Training Ground for the World.* 'A child is not cast upon the Universe as an isolated atom of humanity; he enters, as a new member, the miniature world of home. From the first moment of his appearance, intimate ties connect him with a small group of persons. His earliest lessons show him that on the goodwill of this little group depend his comfort and his happiness. The welfare of the whole is so bound up with the behaviour of the units that the consequences, attending conduct, stand vividly impressed upon his mind. . . . Here, therefore, ready to our hand, is a society which might well serve as a training ground in which the significance of relations can be learned. . . . The world is but an overgrown family; and the world's ideal—the ideal of an association regulated by mutual service and mutual goodwill—is the ideal found most nearly realized within the home' (Bray, *The Town Child*, pp. 303–304).

NOTE F. *Commercial Transactions 'in Terms of Life.'* 'We shall, to sum up all in one master principle, estimate value and cost in terms of life, as Mr. Ruskin has taught us; and, accepting this principle, we shall seek nothing of which the cost to the producer, so measured, exceeds the gain to ourselves. . . . This

excess of cost over value, in terms of life, offers a general criterion of culpable expenditure . . . and it is universally true that we cannot rightly seek anything which costs more in life than it brings in life to us, or, in the case of expenditure for public purposes, to society' (Bishop Westcott on 'Expenditure,' *Christian Social Union Addresses*, pp. 60 ff.).

'The labour question is in the fullest sense of the word a religious question. The workman is commonly said to offer his work in the market as a commodity. In fact he offers himself. If then the conditions of labour are not such as to make a true human life possible for the labourer, if he receives as the price of his toil a mutilated and impoverished manhood, there can be no lasting peace: there can be no prevailing Christian Faith. For a true human life the essential external requisites are adequate food, shelter, leisure, and provision for incapacity or old age. Are we English Churchmen—clergy and laity alike—satisfied that, speaking generally, these are found among our poorer artisans? Nay, rather is it not too plain that they are not found?' (Bishop Westcott, *The Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 64).

NOTE G. *Everyday Business a 'Divine Calling.'*
'It must add immeasurably to the dignity of a man's life . . . if he seriously believes that his work has been given him by Divine appointment—that it really is his calling.'

'Mechanics, merchants, tradesmen, manufacturers, clerks, doctors, lawyers, artists—if we are to live a really Christian life, we must all be sure that whatever work we are doing, it is God's will that we should do it.'

'What right has any man to do anything unless he has a clear and serious conviction that God wants to have it done, and done by him?' (R. W. Dale, from a sermon on 'Everyday Business a Divine Calling,' in *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, pp. 2 ff.).

NOTE H. *The Different Standards of Morality in Family and Commercial Life.* There is no doubt that one chief cause of the absence of the working class from our Churches is the unchristian conduct of professing Christians.

'Clean, kindly, religious men stoop to methods so tricky, hard, and rapacious, that we stand aghast whenever the curtain is drawn aside and we are shown the inside facts. . . . Competitive commerce exalts selfishness to the dignity of a moral principle. . . . It makes Ishmaels of our best men and teaches them that their hand must be against every man, since every man's hand is against them. It makes men who are the gentlest and kindliest friends and neighbours, relentless taskmasters in their shops and stores, who will drain the strength of their men, and pay their female employees wages on which no girl can live without supplementing them in some way' (Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, pp. 264, 265).

'Christianity beautifies many an individual life, and sheds a lustre over many a family. Its influence is less conspicuous in the life of business; it pales in the sphere of what is called society, and is still dimmer in politics; in the region of international obligations it can scarcely be said to exist' (Bishop Creighton, in *The Heritage of the Spirit*, p. 181).

NOTE I. *The Imitation of the Rich by those less well off.* 'The social nature of man makes him an imitative creature. . . . Parasitic wealth is sure to create a vicious luxury which acts as a centre of infection for all other classes. Fashions operate downward. Each class tries to imitate the one higher up, and to escape from the imitation of those lower down . . . the ostentation of the overfull purses of the predatory rich lures all society into the worship of false gods. . . . Anyone can test the matter in his own case by asking himself how much of his money, his time, and his worry is consumed in merely "keeping up with the procession," and is diverted from real culture to mere display by the compulsion of social requirements about him' (Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, pp. 267 ff.).

NOTE J. *Preventible Phthisis among the Poor.* As an example of what may be done by improved housing, sanitation, and conditions of work, I would adduce the following: Northampton is a fairly healthy working-class town of some 93,000 people. The death-rate from phthisis in 1878 was 2·13 per 1000; since then it has declined continuously until in 1908 it was 1·10 per 1000, a decrease in thirty years of almost 50 per cent.

NOTE K. *Dissatisfaction with Present Industrial Conditions.* 'We have just emerged from an industrial revolution. Old ties have been removed. The new ties have not yet been shaped. The spirit of individualism is still invoked to justify boundless self-assertion; and even self-interest is insufficient to restrain ruinous competition. Such anarchy can only last for a brief space.

Already we welcome on every side generous if impatient efforts to establish among us a social order more conformable to the facts of Divine sonship and human brotherhood. Nor need we be disheartened if discontent increases at the time when there is a growing desire to remove the evils by which it is aroused' (Westcott, *The Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 74).

NOTE L. *Man, Machinery, and Organization.* 'When division of labour has been carried so far that each workman has only a single mechanical operation to perform, the next step is to invent a machine which shall do it for him. When this is done, the painfully acquired dexterity of the workman is no longer of any use; and he is apt to be thrown out or reduced to the position of an unskilled workman.' 'Matter has the mastery over mind: the mechanism of industry is not under our control, but runs away with us' (Mackenzie, *An Introduction to Social Philosophy*, pp. 102, 103). It must be remembered that often in a few weeks, even sometimes in a few days, a boy (even a girl) can learn to 'tend' or 'feed' a machine as well as an adult. Thus cheap boy and girl labour is constantly being substituted for adult labour. This is one of the most potent causes of unemployment at the present time.

NOTE M. *Ethics and the Cosmic Principle.* Upon this subject Professor Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics* should be carefully read, especially pp. 79 ff.; also Professor Sorley's remarks on Huxley's treatment of it, in his *Ethics of Naturalism*, pp. 327 ff. Huxley writes: 'Hence the pressing interest of the question, to what extent modern progress in natural knowledge, and,

more especially, the general outcome of that progress in the doctrine of evolution, is competent to help us in the great work of helping one another?' Huxley does not deny 'the origin of the moral sentiments, in the same way as other natural phenomena, by a process of evolution'; nor need the Christian teacher, if he is careful to explain the word 'origin.' Huxley then points out the ambiguity of the phrase 'survival of the fittest.' He does not deny that 'men in society . . . are subject to the cosmic process,' but he holds that 'social progress means a checking of the cosmic process at every step and the substitution for it of another, which may be called the ethical process.' He also asserts that 'the practice of what we call goodness or virtue involves a course of conduct which in all respects is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence.' Then he shows that 'it is from neglect of these plain considerations that the fanatical individualism of our time attempts to apply the analogy of cosmic nature to society.' The whole of his argument, however, should be carefully read.

Professor Sorley shows that 'the true inference to be drawn from Huxley's argument is not that there is a conflict between "Ethics" and "Evolution." The conflict is rather between one stage of evolution and another; between the natural selection which determines animal development and the rational principles and ethical sentiments and ideas which in some degree—and, it may be hoped, in an increasing degree—determine human conduct. These ethical motives have to win their way by conflict—by struggle with other and non-ethical forces, which were appropriate to a lower stage of development, and which yield only gradually to ethical

influence. The power of new motives is strengthened by the conflict; and, as he carries out his ideas to a successful issue, by methods which mere "nature" did not prescribe, man comes to contemplate himself as having a calling and a destiny beyond the physical process from which he has emerged, and as the servant of ideals which that process did not bestow' (pp. 329, 330).

NOTE N. *The Influence of the Clergy.* In many books upon Clerical Life and Work much stress is laid upon the 'personal' life of the clergyman. But, except in regard to his devotions and his studies (and not even to the issues of these), this so-called 'personal' life cannot be separated from his social life. He, as others, must live in society. It is in his social life that his personal life is expressed, that his character and example are felt. Even most of a man's so-called personal habits have a social effect.

I may, or may not, have had exceptional opportunities of knowing the minds of working men, but to this I can testify from a long and wide intimate acquaintance with them, that the 'personal' and 'social' life of the clergy is watched and criticized by them with extraordinary sharpness. The least inconsistency of conduct is noticed, and no allowance is made for failure to live up to the standard which they preach. An earnest clergyman who lived a most consistent life on an extremely high plane once said to me, 'If we were always conscious of how we were watched we should feel almost paralyzed in our actions.' In Canon Liddon's *Clerical Life and Work* there is an excellent sermon on 'The Secret of Clerical Power' (pp. 149 ff.). In this he dwells at some length

upon 'Consistency,' in the course of which he says: 'Consistency is among all men an element of power. It is especially so among Englishmen, because, whatever our national faults, God has given us as a race a natural love of honesty. Thus it often happens that men who themselves stand outside the truth, yet sincerely admire its vivifying power in the lives of others.'

There is an admirable chapter on 'The Pastor as Friend' in Washington Gladden's *Christian Pastor*, in which he writes, 'It is important that the pastor should make himself thoroughly familiar . . . with the busy life of the Community. He will have much to do with the development of this life. His task is . . . the Christianization of all its manifold and multiform activity . . . he gains, by a familiarity with everyday affairs, opportunities of friendship which will greatly add to the fruitfulness of his ministry. . . . It is not by withdrawing from familiar intercourse with the people that the minister best preserves the sanctity of his character. The leaven must be mingled with the meal; and the more thoroughly it is worked into it, the better the results will be. . . . The one task of the minister is to bring the active goodness which exists in the hearts and lives of his people into vital contact with the needs of the human beings round about them. . . . If the pastor wishes his people to do this work he must show them how to do it' (pp. 173 ff.).

The following strong words are by Bishop Lightfoot (*Ordination Addresses*, p. 101): 'How can you expect a tradesman to respect your teaching when you commend the higher graces of humility, self-sacrifice, and the like, if he finds that you do not pay your debts? So with other things . . . it is required of the minister of Christ

that he should not only be ἄμεμπτος, but likewise ἀνεπίλημπτος. He must not only keep himself free from just accusation, but (so far as may be) free from unjust accusation also.'

To these testimonies may be added a most useful chapter on 'The Use of the Opportunity,' in Archbishop Lang's *The Opportunity of the Church of England*, pp. 48 ff., in which he dwells upon the need of 'A broad human sympathy,' 'flexibility of method,' 'maintenance of a high moral standard,' &c.

NOTE O. *The 'Human' Method of Christ.* 'I cannot read the life of Jesus without feeling that it was to this human culture of the spiritual life that He was always leading. This was His constant struggle with the Pharisee and Sadducee. . . . He asked men to own Him as their Lord, because He showed in their divine completeness the qualities, and filled with divine perfectness the relations, of humanity. This was the power of the Incarnation. He appealed directly to the human heart to understand Him, with its native perceptions quickened by His presence' (Phillips Brooks, *Essays and Addresses*, pp. 26, 27).

NOTE P. *The Limits of State Interference.* The literature of 'Socialism' is now enormous, and in its character as diverse [1] as the 'Socialism' which it essays to explain and promote. It must be remembered that many things are advocated in the name of Socialism from which an immense number of Socialists would dissociate themselves; on the other hand, many things

[1] Bishop Westcott on 'Socialism,' in *The Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 225.

are charged against 'Socialists' as a body which are true of only a very small minority of those who claim the title. The growth of 'Collectivist Opinion,' and the progress of collectivist legislation in our own country, may be usefully studied from an independent point of view in Dicey's *Law and Opinion in England*.

The rapid growth of so-called 'Christian Socialism' among a section of the English clergy is undoubtedly due in a measure to certain writings of Bishop Westcott (who to some extent was influenced by Ruskin), and especially to his well-known paper on 'Socialism,' originally read before the Church Congress in 1890. It may perhaps be questioned whether Bishop Westcott foresaw the use which would be made of his words by men who are not always careful to state the whole of his teaching. For example, the following sentences are often quoted: 'Socialism is the opposite of Individualism, and it is by contrast with Individualism that the true character of Socialism can be best discerned. . . . Individualism regards humanity as made up of disconnected or warring atoms; Socialism regards it as an organic whole, a vital unity formed by the combination of contributory members mutually interdependent. . . . The aim of Socialism is the fulfilment of service, the aim of Individualism is the attainment of some personal advantage, riches, or place, or fame.' But those who quote such sentences as these, and are active in promoting socialistic legislation, should remember that Bishop Westcott's idea of a state of Socialism was one in which, 'in full and generous co-operation each citizen shall offer the fulness of his own life that he may rejoice in the fulness of the life of the body.' They must also remember that he

defined 'the thoughts of a true Socialism' as 'the thought that men are "one man" in Christ, sons of God and brethren, suffering and rejoicing together, that each touches all and all touch each with an inevitable influence, that as we live by others we can find no rest till we live for others.' Here everything is voluntary and without any implication of coercive socialistic legislation. In the very same address the bishop 'begs' his hearers 'not to improvise hasty judgments': he reminds them that 'zeal, enthusiasm, devotion are not enough to guide us in the perplexity of conduct; we need above all things knowledge as the basis of action. We have not yet mastered the elements of the problems of society.'

One of the most careful examinations of the nature and aims of Socialism, and one of the most temperate pleas on behalf of a measure of it in practice, will be found in Kirkup's *An Enquiry into Socialism.* The chapters on 'What is Socialism,' 'Current Views of Socialism,' and 'Moral Aspects of Socialism,' if read with an open mind, would serve to dispel much ignorance on the subject. What Mr. Kirkup says about 'Christian Socialists' should be carefully noted, because his description probably exactly explains the position of the vast majority of people who are so designated. 'Christian Socialists especially see in our competitive system merely a very modern form of the principle of self-interest degenerating into a selfishness that refuses to be his brother's keeper, and tending to the dissolution of Society. While professing to be essential to the continuance and conservation of social order, especially of the Church and family, the present system is in the view of such men subversive of Christian morality and ruinous to all sound

and healthy social life. On the other hand, in the much maligned Socialism they find the principle of co-operation and mutual help, which is simply the ethical spirit of Christianity applied to industry and social reform, and would peacefully remove the evils of competition by promoting associations of workmen with a common capital' (p. 16).

NOTE Q. *The Responsibilities of Citizenship.* There is an excellent sermon on 'Citizenship, Human and Divine,' in Bishop Westcott's *Christian Aspects of Life*, pp. 102 ff., in the course of which he says: 'I venture to insist with whatever force I can command, that civil work is an essential part of the service of fellow citizens of the saints. Church work and civil work act and re-act one on the other. We have suffered grievously in the past by their separation. On the one hand, Church life has wanted or seemed to want, breadth, reality, and the freshening impulses which come through the manifold activities of civil enterprise. . . . On the other hand, our civil life has wanted the elevating force which comes from the frank acceptance of great ideals' (p. 112).

See also Professor Henry Jones' *Social Responsibilities* (Lectures to Business Men), where we read: 'The obligations of citizenship are not felt so widely nor so deeply as they ought to be. . . . The ordinary citizen does not always seek to pay his social debt. And the main reason, I believe, is that he is not aware of the extent of his borrowing. . . . Not knowing either the nature or the worth of our inheritance, not realizing either the frailty or the strength of the forces which bind the structure together into the most complicated and

delicate of all the products of human nature, we do not care for it as for our most precious possession, nor do we strive to increase its worth, establishing it ever more firmly on the broad basis of a more enlightened self-consciousness' (pp. 11, 13, 16). [I would strongly commend a study of these excellent lectures.]

NOTE R. *The Asserted Failure of Democracy.* Upon this see an essay on the 'Limitations of Democracy' in L. T. Hobhouse's *Democracy and Reaction.* See also the chapter on 'Democracy and Character' in MacCunn's *Ethics of Citizenship.* In another chapter of this book, that on 'Citizenship,' Professor MacCunn asserts that we are expecting too much of democracy, which, as yet, is only learning as it were (and often through failure) the elements of its worth, and that this work can only be learnt in the school of experience—a school in which human beings are developed. 'Men can only become fit to have votes by first using them . . . to teach men to do their duties to the State, the only finally effective plan is to give them duties to the State to do. . . . Better, surely, that men should learn the lesson of political citizenship, even at some cost of blundering, than that they should never learn it at all' (p. 53).

NOTE S. *National and Municipal Institutions.* 'The powers of the State or city, its capacity for conceiving and carrying out good purposes, rise or fall with the virtues of its members. . . . We sometimes inquire as to the limits of the activity of a State or city: it is an idle question. These depend on the intelligence and integrity of its members. A corrupt or ignorant

city can do little ; it is better that its powers should be kept low ; an enlightened and just community can do much, increasing the happiness and the useful functions of its citizens at every stage of its own advance. Always in city or State the measure of its power is that of the wisdom and uprightness of its citizens' (Henry Jones, *Social Responsibilities*, p. 41).

NOTE T. *The State and the Individual.* First the family, and then the State (or the city), are the environments in which the individual life develops, and out of which, by the process of assimilation (like that of atmosphere or of soil, to which may be compared the spiritual and material constituents of the environment), it finds its materials for growth. To-day one party of social reformers are laying immense stress on individual self-effort, another party on sufficient means and satisfactory conditions. There should be no antagonism between those who are trying to improve either. Both are necessary. It is true that the exceptional personality does manage to grow amid the most adverse surroundings ; but the social reformer has not to think of the exceptional, but of the average, personality. Where the social reformer usually errs is in forgetting that it is the environment of *character*, and not only that of material circumstances, that is so important. It is the 'moral tone' of the family or the community which we must seek to raise for the sake of the individual ; at the same time to help to raise this moral tone of the community is the individual's chief responsibility. Experience proves that the total moral force of a community, as such, is greater than the sum total of the moral forces of its individual members regarded separately.

NOTE U. *Increased Causes of War.* Among these may be mentioned, first, the infinitely more rapid and widespread transmission of news; a hasty, ill-considered utterance by a leading politician is now in a few hours read by millions, and the feeling generated by it becomes in a few hours magnified a thousand times. Secondly, the stress of trade competition is immensely more keen. New markets for goods and new settlements for a congested population must be found. The wars of the near future will largely have their origin in trade. The following sentences were recently spoken at an international gathering: 'The forces hostile to peace are not our monarchs, not our statesmen, not our parliaments, not our men of commerce; all these in both nations are, I believe, the friends of peace. . . . No, but there are undefined national forces which we cannot understand and which we cannot control. They generate suspicion and antagonism; they are full of danger for both nations and they retard the course of human progress. Can it be that the cultivation of sympathy between individuals of both nations may counteract these hostile forces? If so, let us remember that the home of sympathy is the Church of Christ' (from a speech by the Dean of Westminster, at a meeting of English and German religious leaders).

NOTE V. *International Morality.* There is one fact, explain it how we may, with which we have to reckon, that, as our relationships become less close, apparently the difficulty of moralizing them becomes greater. We recognize the claims of morality in our dealings with wife or husband or parents or children with comparative ease. The recognition of these claims

becomes somewhat more difficult when we pass on to our relationships with those we employ, with the shopkeepers with whom we do business, with our fellow-townsmen. The difficulty is still further increased when we come to deal with those who live at a distance from us, with whom our intercourse is intermittent and our connection slight. The higher claims of morality seem often to be almost totally disregarded in our relationships with those who belong to an entirely different nationality, and especially if these are in a much lower scale of civilization than our own. All this is, to some extent, true in regard to our ecclesiastical relationships; we may recognize the claims of the parish, but ignore those of the diocese, or of the Church as a whole. We are apt to assume that Nonconformity hardly deserves courtesy. It is also true in regard to class distinctions, especially in regard to respect for the feelings of those whom we are apt to regard as below us in the social scale. Duty, the practical recognition of the fullest claims of others upon us, certainly begins at home; but it certainly does not end there. In our 'love of the brethren' we are to add 'love' (generally), 2 Pet. i. 7. Family feeling, civic pride, national loyalty are all excellent for fostering strength of feeling and for teaching us our duty in ever-widening fields of helpfulness; but all must be regarded as schools for the education and development of larger responsibilities. Upon no subject is the teaching of Christianity more clear and more useful. Christianity abolished all limits to the claims of others upon us. It taught the necessity of sanctifying the family relationships, but at the same time it asserted that God is the Father of all men. It inculcated the value of the feeling and the ties of brotherhood, but at the same time it asserted the

equal relationship of all to the Divine Son of God, and therefore to each other in Him. In His addresses in the synagogue at Nazareth, and in the parable of the Good Samaritan, our Lord abolishes all claims to national privileges and national superiority. St. Paul asserts that there is neither Jew nor Gentile in Christ Jesus. St. Peter confesses that God is no respecter of persons. The welfare of humanity, of the great universal family, depends upon the moralizing of international relationships, and this moralizing can only be effected by their Christianization. The following sentences from an address by Bishop Westcott on 'The Christian Faith and War' (*Christian Aspects of Life*, pp. 294 ff.) should be carefully pondered: 'When we confess the Incarnation we place every element of humanity in connection with God. . . . The State serves the race, just as the citizen serves the State. In the light of the Christian faith the true interests of nations are identical, because they are the interests of humanity. . . . The Incarnation proclaims a brotherhood of nations no less than a brotherhood of men.'

In connection with the cultivation and maintenance of right relationships, it is most important to notice how large an effect different kinds of bias, or a bias due to different causes or sources, has upon our thought and our conduct. In Herbert Spencer's *Study of Sociology* several useful chapters are concerned with 'The Educational Bias,' 'The Class Bias,' 'The Political Bias,' &c., but there is no bias stronger and none is more likely to warp the judgment than 'The Bias of Patriotism.'

ADDITIONAL NOTE

THE INABILITY OF THE VERY POOR TO DISCHARGE THE FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES

The adequate discharge of the responsibility of parents towards their children involves that the children shall be physically, mentally, and morally (including spiritually) equipped to become thoroughly useful citizens.

Children who are not so equipped may be divided into two classes: 1st, those whose want of equipment is due to causes more or less *within* the control of their parents; 2nd, those whose want of equipment is due to causes mainly *outside* their control. What we have to consider especially is the children of this second class, and the number or relative proportion of the parents of such children.

It will be generally admitted that at present a certain number of people do marry and produce children who ought not to do so. They may be either physically, mentally,[1] or morally unfit to discharge what parental responsibility should involve.

To reduce the number of such marriages we must trust to the growth of a healthier public opinion, and to

[1] A considerable proportion of illegitimate births is due to advantage taken of more or less feeble-minded girls. The 'Care of the Feeble-minded' must include, as far as possible, the care of such girls.

a growing sense of the importance of the science of Eugenics.[1]

Responsibility on the part of *both* parents begins *before* the birth of the child: both father and mother should see that the prenatal conditions for the child are such as will tend towards its healthy development. But, undoubtedly, at the present time, owing to the unemployment or small wages of the father, the mother is frequently compelled to work hard almost up to the time of her confinement. The effects of this on both mother and child are bad.[2]

We have next to think of the first year of a child's life in the homes of the very poor. For information on this I would strongly commend the two chapters on 'Wives and Daughters' in Lady Bell's *At the Works*, especially pp. 197 ff. At the present time great and widespread efforts are being made to reduce infant mortality, and, in some towns, with excellent results.[3] In Middlesbrough, of which Lady Bell writes, it is computed that at least one-third of the infant mortality is from preventible causes. And what possibility is there of proper maternal care for the children that survive? As Lady Bell herself asks, 'What chance has the welfare, physical and moral, of the children thus rapidly brought into the world by a mother whose strength, owing to imperfect nourishment and unhealthy

[1] 'Eugenics' must not be regarded as co-extensive with 'physical eugenics.'

[2] See *Report on Physical Deterioration*, par. 251 ff. and Appendix V. See also a *Report on Inquiry into Employment of Women after Childbirth*, prepared by the Christian Social Union (London Branch), July 1908.

[3] *e.g.* in Huddersfield (see Medical Officer's Report).

surroundings, must be steadily declining under this immense strain as time goes on?' (p. 198).

With regard to the *feeding* of young children, a very large body of painful evidence has recently been made public. In Salford the death-rate per thousand of infants (under 1 year) breast-fed was found to be 128·6, among infants fed on 'condensed milk, &c.,' it was 439·0. In Derby the comparative figures were 69·8 and 197·5. In Finsbury (among children dying of epidemic diarrhœa) the comparative figures were 183 and 460.[1] Dr. Tatham has published some comparative figures of infant mortality in 11 urban and 16 rural counties in England and Wales for the years 1898–1902.[2] From these figures we gather that the average infant mortality among male children in the urban counties was 180·0 per thousand, in the rural counties it was 138·8; among female children the numbers were 149·2 and 111·0.

Side by side with these figures we must put the following conclusions: 'A decrease at the present time in breast-feeding is generally admitted to be the case in all classes of society, at any rate in the urban districts. With the poor it seems fair to say that their failure in this respect is due to inability rather than unwillingness, especially in view of the fact that, as long as it can be properly continued, breast-feeding is much the most economical way of nourishing an infant. It is, however, no doubt the case that women are often unwilling to nurse their own children, because it interferes with their going to work.'[3]

[1] *Women in Industry*, pp. 111 ff.

[2] *Report on Physical Deterioration*, p. 132.

[3] *Report on Physical Deterioration*, p. 50. Upon 'Incompatibility of breast-feeding and factory-employment of mother,' see *Women in Industry*, pp. 117 ff.

Evidence of the evil conditions of large numbers of very young children is ample, as is also that of the evil results of these conditions on their future health; the question of the apportionment of causes between (1) inability,[1] (2) ignorance, and (3) neglect, on the part of parents is an extremely difficult one. The Committee whose *Report* I have just quoted point this out on pp. 55 ff. Recently efforts to combat this ignorance have been instituted by means of 'Schools for Mothers,' Health Visitors, and by instruction in some of the Elementary Schools.[2] In time, no doubt, much may be hoped from these.

I pass to consider children of school-age, *i.e.* between five or six years old and the age at which they begin to work. Here the evidence we have at present must be pronounced as in some degree conflicting, namely, as to the *number* or *proportion* of children attending the Elementary Schools who can be said to be underfed,[3] though, that a very large number of children attending schools in the poorer parts of our large towns are so, is generally admitted. The most conclusive evidence of the effects of insufficient feeding and of bad housing conditions combined is furnished by the anthropometric surveys of children which have recently been made. The most complete tables yet available are those drawn out by Dr. Mackenzie and Captain Foster, in *The Physical Condition of Children attending the Public Schools of the School Board for Glasgow*,[4] in which the comparative heights and weights of a very large number of children of all ages from five to eighteen, living in

[1] Due to poverty. [2] *e.g.* in Birmingham.

[3] *Report on Physical Deterioration*, pp. 59 ff. On 'Extent of Under-feeding,' see pp. 66 ff.

[4] Published as a Blue Book [Cd. 3637].

homes one, two, three, and four or more rooms, are given. In these tables it is shown, that at the same age the average height and weight of both boys and girls at all ages varies directly with the number of rooms in the home, in other words with the ability of their parents or guardians to pay rent; though doubtless this ability, to some extent, depends on the thrift and sobriety, as well as on the actual earnings, of the parents.[1] Also the nature of the food which the children obtain will to some extent depend on the knowledge of the mother and the care she exercises in purchasing and cooking.

Another aspect of the same question is the *extent* of poverty existing at the present time. The two most complete investigations into this which have been made, are those of Mr. Chas. Booth for London, and Mr. Rowntree for York. Mr. Chas. Booth estimates that 30·7 per cent. of the whole population of London are on or below the poverty line; that is, have an income not exceeding 21*s.* per week per family. While Mr. Rowntree writes:[2] 'The wages paid for unskilled labour in York are insufficient to provide food, shelter, and clothing adequate to maintain a family of moderate size (*e.g.* father, mother, and three children) in a state of bare physical efficiency, no allowance being made for any expenditure other than that absolutely required for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency.'[3]

[1] 'The Feeding of School Children' Act of 1906 provides for recovery of costs for feeding from parents able to pay. Unfortunately the adoption of the Act is permissive.

[2] *Poverty, a Study of Town Life*, p. 133. The following pages should be carefully read.

[3] The number of persons living in this class was estimated at 7,230 in York, *i.e.* roughly about one-tenth of the population. The 'Poverty' of more than 50 per cent. of this class was found

It is still frequently asserted, and I fear as commonly believed, *by those who have no knowledge of the facts, and no wide and intimate acquaintance with the real life of the poor*, that when people suffer from poverty, 'it is generally in some way or other their own fault.' If this were true the work of the social reformer would be immensely simplified; but unfortunately the actual facts, so far as they have been discovered, do not bear out this assertion. Mr. Chas. Booth gives the result of 4,000 cases carefully investigated, 1,600 of which were 'very poor,' and 2,400 'poor.' Of the 'very poor,' 4 per cent. were loafers, 14 per cent. were due to drink and thriftlessness, 27 per cent. were due to large families, illness, &c., and 55 per cent. to questions of employment. Of the 'poor,' 13 per cent. were due to drink and thriftlessness, 19 per cent. were due to large families, illness, &c., and 68 per cent. to unemployment.

Recently a most careful investigation into the causes of unemployment of men and women (who registered themselves as unemployed) was made in Manchester. Of the men only 4 per cent. could be said to be unemployed through being 'unsuitable for the work or incompetent,' and only 10·8 per cent. had been discharged for 'misconduct, losing time, &c., or were unworthy'; 3 per cent. had left work of their own accord, and rather more than 7 per cent. were physically unfit. Thus less than 18 per cent. were out of work through *causes within* their own control.[1]

to be due to 'lowness of wages' (apart from sickness, unemployment, irregularity of work, &c). In a lengthy Appendix to the *Report on Physical Deterioration*, Mr. C. S. Loch has questioned the correctness of both Booth's and Rowntree's estimates of the amount of poverty.

[1] From results of a census of unemployed made in Manchester, March 1909. To test the correctness of the replies to inquiries,

It is frequently asserted that 'drink is the chief cause of poverty,' and that could we abolish intemperance, we could abolish by far the greater proportion of the poverty which exists. As an abstainer and temperance worker of more than twenty-five years' standing, I am not likely to discount the evil effects of drink, of which, I firmly believe, only active temperance workers, and not even a large proportion of these, have any adequate conception.[1] While they are literally appalling, drink as a primary cause will not account, even indirectly, for half the poverty of this country.[2] By far the greatest of all causes of poverty is insufficiency of income, due to lowness of wages, unemployment, or only casual employment. How to provide the immense number of the unemployed workers (who are willing to work) with work, the casual workers with regular work, and the low-paid workers with sufficient wages—how to secure for all these at least such an income as would be sufficient to keep themselves and their families in a state of physical efficiency, is the most difficult problem of the

600 cases (taken haphazard from more than 15,800) were carefully investigated. It was found that of these more than 80 per cent. had given correct replies to the questions asked.

[1] See Bishop Pereira, *Intemperance* (in the Handbooks for the Clergy), p. 2.

[2] '"Drink" as the chief pauperizing agent has been brought constantly before us throughout the inquiry, and there can be no doubt that it is one of the principal causes of pauperism. It is, however, for the most part, but the effect of causes which require to be sought out and removed. With some of these our report deals, such as dangerous and unhealthy conditions of work, excessive hours, low wages, and bad housing. Other contributory causes may be the too abundant facilities for drinking, and the paucity of easily accessible means of healthy and reasonable recreation' (Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, *Appendix Volume*, xvi. pp. 183, 184).

social worker to-day. Till this can be done we cannot blame these people for neglecting to discharge their parental responsibilities, *because they are not able to discharge them.*

It is in face of this fact,—that there are a large number of parents in the United Kingdom, who, through no fault of their own, are unable to maintain themselves and their children in physical efficiency,—that social reformers have disagreed as to the best and wisest course to adopt. I have in Note D already stated the views of well-known authorities on both sides. Briefly the question is this, Shall we run the risk of weakening parental responsibility, or shall we more than run the risk of an increased death-rate, a large amount of unnecessary sickness and suffering, and the growing up of a large number of people who are physically, and consequently to some extent mentally, inefficient, and of whom many will, in various ways, become hereafter a burden upon the community? I grant there are two sides to the question. At the same time, I feel sure that if a law were not only passed, but strictly administered (as suggested in the Minority Report of the recent Poor Law Commission), by which parents able to pay were made to pay, there would be comparatively small risk of lessening parental responsibility.

But the inability of very poor parents to discharge their responsibilities does not consist only in their being unable to provide sufficient food for their children, it lies also in their being unable to provide them with decent and healthy homes. And this is as true, if indeed it is not even more widely true, of the country poor as it is of the town poor. Then we must remember that here evil moral effects no less than evil physical effects upon the children

are involved. Insufficient bedroom accommodation tends to destroy modesty as well as health, and, as I have already said, modesty is the safeguard of purity. There is more than sufficient evidence to show that extremely evil housing conditions are appallingly common, both in town slums and country villages. But this evidence is largely buried in Blue Books and Reports. The vast majority of well-to-do professing Christians have no real knowledge of it.[1] By the census of 1901 it was found that there were in London 149,524 tenements of a single room. In these 40,762 persons were living at the rate of three or more persons (per room) in these single rooms. There were 86,132 persons living at the rate of four or more persons in two-roomed tenements.[2] What do these last figures mean? A two-roomed tenement generally means a living room and one bedroom! The evil is by no means confined to London. In certain districts in Edinburgh 'not less than 45 per cent. of the population live in one-roomed or two-roomed dwellings.' 'In the North Canongate district 76 per cent. of the population live under these conditions'; 'in these one or two-roomed dwellings there are often seven, eight, or nine children, besides the father and mother.' In Sheffield 'there are 15,000 back-to-back houses, most of these with no more than three rooms, and sometimes occupied by eight, ten, or even twelve persons.'[3]

Why are such conditions allowed to exist? For the answer we must again turn to Blue Books. 'Most of the bad houses are owned by members of the local

[1] If only these would read the chapter on 'The Housing Problem' in *The Heart of the Empire!*

[2] Booth, *Life and Labour in London*, final volume, p. 5.

[3] *Report on Physical Deterioration*, p. 22.

bodies, and the sanitary authorities are too much in awe of their employers to carry out their duty.' 'In some cases the interests of manufacturers and property owners have been alleged to interfere with the proper exercise of the functions of local administration, and behind the whole system there is no sufficient driving power' (in other words, no sufficient enlightened and earnest public opinion) 'to secure that adequate pressure shall be brought to bear on the careless or indifferent.'[1] 'Another change which might effectually reinforce the cry for improvement in many places, would be to grant security of tenure to the Medical Officers of Health, who as a rule hold office at the goodwill of the Local Authority.'[2]

At the risk of wearying the reader I will add the following extracts from another official publication:—

'Large tracts of land are to be found where the landlord is rarely, if ever, in occupation. The rents are collected by agents, whose main object is to spend as little as possible on repairs. Some agents seldom undertake repairs unless the inspector serves a notice; and it is too frequently the inspector's practice to be as inactive as possible.'[3]

'Indifference or want of means among owners of cottage property is a further reason. A good deal of evidence has been submitted, showing that there are in villages many owners of cottage property, of a class little removed from the station in life of their tenants, to whom cottage property appeals as a safe investment, and who are indisposed to curtail their profits. Numbers of

[1] *Report on Physical Deterioration*, p. 23.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 23.

[3] *Report on the Housing of the Working Classes Amendment Bill* [376], p. 12.

cottages are owned by persons who are punctual in demanding their rents, but do not exercise a corresponding responsibility in keeping the cottages in repair. Neglect leads to insanitary dilapidation, which, unchecked by the local authority, leads to the creation of village slums. The effect is two-fold: it drives the better class tenant to the towns, and degrades those who remain. When the owners of village slum property find it a profitable investment, there is a strong disinclination to attract attention to the need for more or better cottages, as, in the event of these being provided, the bad cottages would become unoccupied. On many Rural District Councils members may be found who are interested in property of this character.'[1]

'The above conditions, which are prevalent throughout the country, are sufficient reason for vigilant attention on the part of the local authority. The insanitary and indeed deplorable condition of much of the existing cottage property at the present moment must be attributed to the perfunctory administration of the ample powers those authorities possess.'[2]

To this evidence the following may be added:—

'The shameful overcrowding of children of all ages and the life in one room to which the high rents in London condemn such large numbers of the people allow of no training in elementary decency, much less in modesty and self-respect. That it even causes vice of the worst type we have been assured by men who are officially engaged in vigilance work.'[3]

[1] *Report on the Housing of the Working Classes Amendment Bill* [376], p. 13. [2] *Ibid.* p. 13.

[3] Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, *Appendix Volume*, xvi. p. 57.

'Housing conditions produce or aggravate certain illnesses' [*e.g.* phthisis]. 'Again, housing conditions produce or aggravate certain demoralized types of character.'[1]

There is another factor in parental responsibility which must not be forgotten; upon this not only is the evidence overwhelming, but upon it there is practically entire agreement among all schools of social reformers; I refer to 'Boy-labour.'

At present in an immense number of cases, and very frequently owing to the poverty of the parents, the very day a boy can, by law, leave the elementary school, he is put to that work whereby he can at once earn the maximum immediate wage. I need not dwell on the results. Recently they have been made widely known. Briefly, the chief of these—apart from the injury to the boy himself—is the flooding of the labour market with untrained and unskilled workers. The two following testimonies must suffice: (1) The Majority Report of the recent Poor Law Commission states, 'One point bearing upon the question of casual labour which strongly impressed us is the extent to which boys leaving the elementary schools are drafted into work which lasted only a few years, and then flung them out, unskilled and untrained, into the casual labour market.'[2] (2) The Minority Report states, 'There is no subject as to which we have received so much and such conclusive evidence as upon the extent to which thousands of boys, for lack of any sort of training for industrial occupations, grow up, almost inevitably, so as to become chronically

[1] Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, *Appendix Volume*, xvi. p. 181.

[2] Par. 545.

unemployed, or under-employed, and presently to recruit the ranks of the unemployable.'[1]

There is, of course, a darker side to this question, viz. that here, as so often, 'the necessity of the poor is the opportunity of those better off.' Upon this aspect Professor Sadler, who has made a special study of the problem, writes thus: 'Certain forms of industry, which make large use of boys and girls who have recently left the elementary schools, are in part (except where the employers make special efforts to meet their responsibilities) parasitic and get more than they ought, and more than their promoters realize they are getting, of the physical and moral capital of the rising generation.'[2]

It is easy to blame the parents, and in a great many cases, through selfishness, idleness, and intemperance the parents are to blame; but in many other cases, for instance where the mother is a widow or the father is out of work or at work on low wages, it is simply *imperative* that the children should, as soon as they can, earn as much as possible. Thus during the years when well-to-do parents are giving their sons such an education as may fit them to become useful and intelligent citizens, the parents among the very poor have to sacrifice the future prospects of their children in order to satisfy the immediate physical needs of the family.

I have brought forward all this evidence for the following reason: The object of these lectures is to examine existing Social Relationships in the light of Christianity. One of the most important of these relationships is that of parents to children. For its

[1] Part ii. ch. iv. E, iii.

[2] Sadler, *Continuation Schools in England and elsewhere*, p. xiii.

adequate discharge the parent should at least be able to provide for his children that which is necessary for their physical and moral development towards physical and moral efficiency. What I contend, and what I believe there is more than sufficient evidence to prove, is that at present, partly from unemployment and insufficient wages (both in a large proportion of cases outside the control of the father), partly from the existing state of the law and still more from the want of proper administration of the law, there are a very large number of parents in this country who, mainly through no fault of their own, *cannot* discharge even their primary responsibilities to their children ; and that they never will be able to discharge these responsibilities except through such a change in our social system as can only be brought about by an immense change—a great Christianization—of public opinion. To bring this change about is the chief duty and should be the primary task of all Christian churches and Christian organizations to-day.

I could proceed to show, for the evidence is ample, how unpractical and unsuitable is much of our elementary education at the present time. If the country stood in need of an almost unlimited supply of second-rate clerks, both male and female, then I should say we were likely to meet the demand.[1] But if we want thoughtful,

[1] 'There seems to be outside the circle of the teaching profession a very strong general feeling that the education of our children in elementary schools is not of the kind which is helpful to them in after life. . . . The desire of the young to raise themselves in the social scale and improve their position should ever be encouraged, but this desire seems to us too frequently to take the shape of trying to avoid handicraft and manual labour by recourse to other occupations which, though associated with a black coat, are less remunerative and less progressive than skilled handiwork. Clerical

practical, skilful workpeople, especially on the land, and also capable and healthy mothers and housewives, then I assert that we are going altogether the wrong way to supply our needs.

I am not a socialist. I do not feel in the least convinced, that if 'the community owned all the land and the capital and the means of production,' our social evils would be cured. But I do believe that, *under existing conditions or circumstances*, for the well-being of future generations, which is the well-being of the nation, we must have a further extension of State aid and State intervention in the education and upbringing of the children of the very poor, in order that they may be brought into the world under more satisfactory conditions, and in order to secure for them healthier homes, at least sufficient food, and a more useful education. I am quite prepared to admit that by every such aid or intervention we do run a serious risk of weakening still further the sense of parental responsibility, a responsibility which, I believe, God intended parents to bear, both for their own good and for the good of their children. But if, as is surely the case, we have allowed conditions to develop in which many parents *cannot* discharge their responsibilities towards their children; then, instead of allowing the children to suffer, and another generation of largely

labour is a glut upon the market; high-class artisans are, according to our evidence, at times obtained with difficulty. We doubt if the atmosphere of our school life is altogether congenial to a career of manual labour. We would suggest to the Board of Education the advisability of meeting these criticisms by a thorough reconstruction of the time-table and curriculum in our elementary schools as well as of the aims and ideals of elementary education' (Report of the Poor Law Commission, 1909: 'Majority' Report, Part ii. par. 128).

incapable men and women to grow up, we must, I contend, provide these children with the means necessary for their proper development. Is it not the lesser of the two evils for the State to intervene, at least so far as to secure for these children what is essential for their physical, mental, and moral efficiency? How otherwise can we hope that they will grow up into capable and useful citizens?

[Since this note was written there has been published a pamphlet of some 115 pages (with many excellent tables) entitled, *How the Casual Labourer Lives: the Report of the Liverpool Joint Research Committee on the Domestic Condition and Expenditure of the Families of Certain Liverpool Labourers* (The Northern Publishing Co., Liverpool).

This Report, which is very much on the same lines as much in Mr. Rowntree's *Poverty*, gives a very full description of the housing and economic conditions (including a large number of 'weekly budgets' of income and expenditure) among casual workers, mainly dock-labourers, in Liverpool. It is a further revelation of the great disabilities, economic and otherwise—often beyond their own control—under which large numbers of the poor are existing.]

LECTURE II

LECTURE II

THE OLD TESTAMENT

Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope (Rom. xv. 4).

Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil (St. Matt. v. 17).

He appeared unto them as they strove, and would have set them at one again, saying, Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another? (Acts vii. 26).

Two convictions which I expressed at the commencement of the previous lecture may, I hope, be regarded as fully proved. These were, first, that the welfare of both the individual and of society —assuming that, even in imagination, these can be regarded separately—depend upon the right or adequate discharge of the social relationships; and secondly, that in this country—I limited our survey to this field—the discharge of these social relationships is in a large proportion of instances most imperfect. I also showed that very frequently in the case of the family relationships, and to some extent as regards the commercial relationships, they

are imperfectly discharged because a very large number of people are living under physical and economic conditions which render their adequate discharge practically impossible.[1]

This being so, it is surely our duty to inquire as to what influence or influences we can look for a reformation or improvement of these relationships. And I think we must admit that, whatever be the nature of this reformation, it must be one which implies a great improvement in the conditions under which certain of these relationships are discharged —if they can be said to be discharged—at the present time.

Both the end and the instrument or means of the discharge of all the various social relationships are identical, namely human nature. This being so, I shall assume that whatever means we employ for their improvement, these must include: first, a wide knowledge of human nature, together with a deep insight into its needs; and secondly, a lofty view of its possibilities. That which is to be reformed must first be understood. We must also believe in the possibility of the reform we desire to accomplish; we must be equally convinced of the efficacy of the method we would employ. Towards the strengthening of these convictions actual experience in the past is the greatest of all possible

[1] See Additional Note to Lecture I.

aids. And experience is unanimous upon two points: first, that those who would raise or improve men, besides understanding men, must take a lofty view of man's possibilities; secondly, that they must always appeal to the highest in man.[1] Failures through forgetfulness of this last rule are strewn thickly over the history of social reform, indeed from this cause failure is actually being courted by more than one social movement to-day.[2]

Judged by these requirements—first, a deep insight into human nature and its needs; secondly, a lofty view of its possibilities, together with its method of appealing to the highest in man—Christianity stands pre-eminent among all the various influences which may be brought upon man and upon society. I have never heard the assertion as to Christ's wonderful insight into human nature—'He Himself knew what was in man'[3]—contradicted. Christ's infinite belief in the possibilities of human nature is attested by His becoming Incarnate, by His historic life, and by His sufferings and His death on man's behalf.[4] History also, I think, furnishes

[1] Note A.

[2] *e.g.* by certain schemes of more or less revolutionary Socialism. A well-reasoned protest against revolutionary tendencies will be found in *Evolutionary Socialism*, by Edward Bernstein (vol. vii. of the Socialist Library).

[3] St. John ii. 25. Note B.

[4] Phil. ii. 5 ff.

sufficient evidence to prove that the finest characters which have ever existed have been those in which the Christian virtues have been pre-eminent, and in whose formation Christian influences have been strongest.[1] In the light of all this evidence, therefore, I propose to examine what Christianity has to offer towards the solution of our problem, namely towards the more perfect moralizing or humanizing of the various social relationships. This, as I have already stated, I believe we shall find to be identical with their more perfect Christianization.

To this term 'Christianization' I wish to give a wide, but at the same time, I believe, a perfectly legitimate interpretation. We are accustomed to date the coming of Christianity into the world from the birth of Jesus Christ. For some purposes such a method of reckoning may be permitted; but for an investigation such as I am now about to pursue it is quite insufficient, not to say misleading. Organized Christianity is as old as Abraham.[2] Christian ideas, Christian hopes and assurances are found to be interwoven with every stage of the history of the people who claim Abraham as their founder right up to the time of the Incarnation.[3] From that time Christian hopes are centred

[1] Note C. [2] Note D.

[3] 'The Jewish State was at the same time the Kingdom of God on earth. . . . There is a double identity, notwithstanding all their

in Jesus Christ, as Christian ideas are expressed in His life and teaching, and in the lives and teaching of those who profess to believe in Him.

Now if there was one conviction which the first Christian teachers held at least as strongly as any other, it was, that while in one sense the coming of Jesus was a consummation, and as such might be regarded as the end of a dispensation, yet in another and an equally true sense it marked only a step, though doubtless one of infinite importance, in the history of God's covenant people, that is in the history of the Messianic or Christ people. St. Paul was convinced, and, at least implicitly, again and again asserted, that he and his fellow-Christians were the true spiritual descendants of Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Isaiah, and Amos. It was the followers of Jesus who were the true and legitimate heirs of the privileges both promised and granted to God's faithful people in the past. It was St. Paul's Jewish adversaries who, by their unbelief and by their treatment of Jesus, had cut themselves off from the spiritual succession. The teaching of St. Peter is the same.[1]

difference, between the Old and the New Testaments. There is first the objective identity, the sameness of principles and truths. . . . And there is the subjective identity of the mind in which the truth resided' (A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, pp. 9, 14).

[1] Note E.

The reason why I lay stress upon this here is, that from time to time attacks are made upon the *insufficiency* of the ethical and social teaching of the New Testament. It is stated that whole spheres of conduct are left unnoticed, and that upon many of the common duties of life the New Testament gives little guidance. These charges of insufficiency, when carefully examined, and when implicit as well as explicit teaching is considered, will generally be found to have a very small basis of actual fact.[1] What we must not only remember but constantly assert is, that the ethical and social teaching of the New Testament presupposes the higher ethical and social teaching of the Old Testament, including, of course, the Apocrypha.[2] The Old Testament was actually the great manual of conduct for the earliest Christians. The teaching of Christ did not abrogate its chief principles: it rather amplified its teaching and supplied its deficiencies.

I need not stay to remind you that even the so-called 'historical' books of the Old Testament contain much more than history.[3] They contain

[1] See the chapter on 'What the Gospel assumes' in my *Social Principles of the Gospel*, pp. 7 ff.

[2] The Septuagint was, of course, the Bible of by far the greater number of the early Christians: we lose much to-day by neglect of the study of such books as Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus.

[3] In the Hebrew Bible Joshua to 2 Kings are the '*Prophetae Priores*.'

a philosophy of history—a very definite one. Similarly, the more directly didactic portions of the Bible contain a definite philosophy of life and conduct, including implicitly a philosophy of society. I use the word 'philosophy' in its strictest sense as connoting that which attempts to give a complete explanation, indeed the ultimate explanation, as well as a complete synthesis of that with which it deals. The correctness of the biblical philosophy of the world, of life, and of society has been proved by experience in tens of thousands of instances. The greatest (when they have been humble-minded), the wisest, and the most learned in all ages have not only tested, but proved, the truth of its insight and the value of its guidance by daily practice. The fiercest assaults have been made upon its instruction; but they have been made in vain. A searching criticism has modified opinion upon the exact nature, date, origin, and composition of many of its parts; but only to make its narratives—their meaning and their teaching—clearer and more useful.

There is one point upon which I must dwell for a moment. We are often told that the revelation of God in the Bible, and so its teaching, is 'progressive,' and that consequently its ethical conceptions and ethical precepts, and therefore its social ideas and social laws, are also progressive. But this statement

requires very careful qualification.[1] It certainly would not be true to assert that, if we could arrange the contents of the Bible in strictly chronological order, we should find a continuous progress from first to last in the loftiness of its spiritual conceptions and its ethical teaching. Actually the spiritual and ethical teaching of Amos and Hosea is far superior to that of Leviticus, as is that of Jeremiah to that of Ecclesiastes.[2]

I mention this because we must remember that the ethical teaching of the Bible is the subject of revelation, which, from the human side, we may term inspiration. The great teachers of the Bible did not arrive at their doctrines of man and of society only by a process of natural induction. God rather revealed these to them as they were (proved themselves to be) fit subjects for inspiration.[3] The truthfulness of their teaching may well be tested by induction, and the results so arrived at are proving a very useful branch of apologetics;[4] but this is a very different matter from asserting that the biblical writers arrived at this teaching solely by induction.

[1] Note F.

[2] Leviticus is now generally recognized to be in its present form a post-exilic work, and Ecclesiastes to be not earlier than the third century B.C.

[3] Note G.

[4] I have shown the 'apologetic' value of the results of the inductive method in sociology in my *Social Teaching of St. Paul*, pp. 90 ff., 144 ff.

What I would emphasize is that we must recognize that there is every need of extreme care in the use or acceptance of such terms as 'development' and 'progress.' The popular assumption of 'a continuous development' is not borne out by the facts of history; for how on this hypothesis are we to account for periods, often extremely long ones, of degeneration, and of which history gives so many and such painful examples? What I would insist upon is that the great ethical and social laws of the Bible, however mediated or conveyed to man, are of Divine origin. Perhaps we might liken the world to a very complicated and intricate piece of mechanism put into the hands of men. But, besides this machine, there is from time to time put into the hands of a man of exceptional ability—in the case before us a man of exceptional fitness to receive the Divine revelation—a code of rules or key, which this exceptional man is capable of understanding, and in obedience to which the machine may be more perfectly worked. I shall return to this subject again when I speak of the insufficiency of the 'ethics of naturalism.'[1] I mention it here because, in dealing with the ethical and social teaching of the Old Testament, it is most necessary to be extremely cautious in accepting the principle of

[1] See pp. 288 ff.

so-called progressive revelation. Certainly a study of the actual facts of history shows that the term does require very careful qualification.

There is yet another point in regard to which care is necessary before we proceed to draw inferences from the ethical and social teaching of the Old Testament. Many of its books are extremely composite structures. It is not merely that we find documents of various ages embedded in the same book; frequently these documents have been 'worked over,' and possibly by more than one writer, before the final writer incorporated them. Here is the account of an event which took place in the far distant past; it may be recorded either as a step in the history of God's people, or as an example of what should or should not have been done, *i.e.* it is cited as an exhortation or a warning. In these cases great care is needed to distinguish the ethical standards—first, of the age in which the action took place, then those of the original narrator, and thirdly, those of the writer in whose work it is now found. It is almost impossible for a historian or an editor to describe a scene or even an action without in some way colouring his description with his own judgment. All this does not make the account untrustworthy, it only emphasizes the need for care in its study, and so in the use we make of it. It serves also to explain what must otherwise be a

difficulty, namely the frequent occurrence of somewhat diverse ethical judgments found in close contiguity.

In my last lecture I drew attention to five social relationships, and I produced evidence of the imperfect discharge of each at the present time. Now in studying the ethical teaching of the Old Testament, and especially its treatment of these particular social relationships, two methods of procedure seem to be open to us. One of these methods would be to study what the Old Testament has to say on these by examining the various passages in it which deal with each relationship. Another method would be to study the ethical teaching or ethical conceptions in regard to each relationship chronologically, and to trace the changes in these conceptions from age to age. Something may be said for each method; but, as my object in these lectures is utilitarian rather than historical, is to show what the Old Testament teaches upon a number of definite and closely related questions of conduct, we must, I think, put on one side the strictly historical method.

I

(A) I will begin by examining the teaching of the Old Testament upon the family relationships; first, that of husband and wife, and then that of parents

and children. It will be understood that, owing to limitations of space, only a few out of a great number of passages available for our purpose can be studied here. Possibly the earliest biblical teaching upon the marital relationship is that contained in the prophetic 'Jahvist' narrative[1] of creation, 'a narrative which,' says Professor Driver, 'is valuable, not as a description of historical events, but as a declaration of certain valuable ideas.'[2] For our immediate purpose, considering the brevity of its contents, the teaching is extremely full and clear. Within the compass of a few verses, among other truths, we have asserted, first, the essentially social nature of man; secondly, that only in the society of one morally and intellectually his equal can this nature find satisfaction.[3] Then the picture of woman also asserts her dependence upon man, her natural position at man's side as ready to help him, and man's natural duty to cherish his wife as part of himself. There is another point in this account of this earliest and fundamental relationship which must not be overlooked, namely the stress laid upon the *growth* of the attachment between man and wife.[4] It is not said 'they are,' but 'they shall be,' they *are to become into*, one flesh; where 'flesh,' as

[1] See Driver's *Genesis*, pp. xiv–xviii.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 36; cp. pp. 55 ff.

[3] Because otherwise man cannot develop his capacities by exercise of his faculties.

[4] Note H.

so often in the Old Testament as well as in the New, has far more than a merely material or physical significance.[1] This growth of attachment is thus placed before us as an issue of the Divine purpose in creation. In the next chapter we have the story of the defeat of this perfect union, among other Divine purposes, by sin. From the first we find sin to be the great separating, the chief desocializing[2] power. It injures and prevents the perfection of relationship. It destroys that which, in one sense of the word, is natural, namely according to the ordinance of God. Then we notice that when Eve has plucked the fruit and tasted its pleasantness, her first impulse is to share what she enjoys with Adam; thus we are taught that it is natural to human nature, to a social being, to share: the woman's nature is not even now wholly corrupt, wholly selfish. She would have her husband share that which gives her pleasure. Is there any pleasure in that which cannot be, which is not, shared? Only that which is shared should be good and not evil. Have we not, again, in this further incident, another proof of the essentially social nature of man, and also (in view of the consequences) of the need of moralizing the social relationships?

[1] Note I.

[2] This is a truth upon which in all kinds of 'social' work we cannot lay too much stress.

This great passage which describes to us the fundamental purpose of God in the creation of man and woman, and which depicts for us the ideal and describes how that ideal was lost, belongs in all probability to the ninth century B.C.[1] To that period we may probably assign the beginning of what we may term the highest teaching of the prophets of Israel. It was the age of Elijah, who in a true sense was the spiritual father of Amos, Hosea, and Micah. We may thus regard this teaching as the stream-head of the best and highest ethical and social teaching of the Old Testament. It sets before us a standard at once of spirituality and morality[2] which was never surpassed till our Lord Himself came preaching the Kingdom of God. If, as is quite possible, this passage was written in the time of Ahab, it is a striking instance of the brightest light shining amid gross darkness. Might it not even be read as a very wonderful commentary upon the corruption of the social life of Israel through the influence of the Tyrian queen? It has one feature which must be carefully noted. There are many ethical conceptions which grow. That cannot be said of the ethical and spiritual contents

[1] Driver, *Genesis*, p. xvi; other scholars attribute it to the eighth century.

[2] It must be remembered that the term 'spiritual' does not always connote moral; we need a word which would connote the combination 'morally-spiritual.'

of this passage. Even our Lord has nothing to add to it in the way of an ideal; He only asserts what should be the inevitable corollary.[1] As man and woman develop in civilization, in knowledge, and in culture, they may mutually impart much more to each other, but the fundamental principle and ideal of the unity here portrayed cannot develop. It is one of the foundations[2] of the city of God. It is established once for all. It belongs to the category of those things of which God said, 'Let there be.'

The whole teaching of the Old Testament, as also of the New, upon marriage is but an exhortation to realize the ideal here set forth. To this passage a well-known saying of the Rabbis, upon another passage, may be applied: 'This is the law, the rest is but commentary,' yet it is a commentary of peculiar interest and value. The histories of Abraham, Sarah and Hagar, of Jacob, Leah, Rachel, Bilhah and Zilpah, of David, Michal and Bathsheba, of Solomon and the chief cause of his failure, together with what are pictured to us as their inevitable consequences, these, as well as the pathetic story of Hosea and his unfaithful wife, the

[1] St. Matt. xix. 4 ff. 'Married couples were in respect of unity, as the first pair created by God, destined for one another. Divorce therefore should be out of the question . . . from an ideal standpoint it is not to be thought of' (W. C. Allen *in loc.*).

[2] Heb. xi. 10.

contents of the Deuteronomic legislation,[1] the reforms of Ezra,[2] the strictures of 'Malachi,'[3] must one and all be read with the second and third chapters of Genesis in the background. In every case behind the actual conditions and their issues we must keep in view the ideal standard. Every case I have mentioned is an instance of failure to attain it or maintain it; each contains a warning and describes a result of that failure; each reveals to us some condition which makes the ideal 'they shall become one flesh' impossible. It is when, from one or more of the all too many possible causes, husband and wife continue to be, or even become more completely, 'twain' that the mischief enters, and the inevitable fatal issues proceed. Here, if anywhere, *corruptio optimi pessima.*

(B) I pass to the second of the family relationships—that between parents and children. Though I treat this relationship separately, I am not forgetful that failure in it frequently arises from the imperfection in the relationship between the parents themselves.[4] Character is largely the result of the

[1] Deut. xxii. 13 ff.

[2] Ezra x.; cp. Neh. xiii. 23 ff.

[3] Mal. ii. 10 ff. In marriage between those of different faiths the ideal union is impossible, because the strongest of all uniting forces is absent. Evidences of this are constantly met with to-day.

[4] To the children above all the parents should be one. Where they are divided the moral effect must be akin to that of polytheism.

'internalizing' of circumstances, especially during the period of childhood, when the powers of assimilation are strongest. Now of all 'circumstances' that of the moral atmosphere is one of the most potent.[1] It is certainly the most penetrating. Thus the characters of children are to a great extent formed out of the moral atmosphere of the home. In this atmosphere the relationship between the parents, its quality as well as its strength, is the most powerful of all ingredients.

In the Old Testament treatment of the relationship of parents and children it is upon the sense of responsibility on the part of the parent and upon the need of obedience on the part of the children that stress is chiefly laid.[2] In the Old Testament many instances of tender love are recorded,[3] though this quality of relationship does not occupy relatively the position it does in the New Testament and in later Christian teaching. The end of a right relationship between parents and children is in the Old Testament stated to be the welfare of the community, as in the fifth commandment.

[1] The social reformer must be careful not to confine 'environment' to material environment; see my *Social Principles of the Gospel*, ch. viii. pp. 79 ff.

[2] Upon the relations of parents and children there is an excellent section in Murray's *Handbook of Christian Ethics*, pp. 262 ff.

[3] Hagar, Gen. xxi. 16; David, 2 Sam. xii. 16 ff.; xviii. 33; the Shunammite, 2 Kings iv. 19 ff., &c.

Of course it is implied, as we shall see, that this national welfare depends on the cultivation, through a right relationship, of the moral virtues, which here, as always, are regarded as the foundation of national stability.[1] These moral virtues are also regarded as theological, that is they issue from the Divine Will and therefore are part of the nature or character of God. Here I must be content to draw attention to four authorities, each of which is probably separated from the preceding by about two hundred years.

In that most important eighteenth chapter of Genesis[2]—again a part of the 'Jahvist' narrative—God's choice of Abraham, God's special revelation to him, is said to have been governed by, and is to issue in, Abraham's sense of responsibility towards his family and his household—the primary objects of every true father's care. 'I have known[3] him, to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the LORD to do justice and judgment; to the end that the LORD may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him.' Notice that in the word 'command'[4] we have implied the exercise of a very definite authority, and that in the words 'to

[1] Deut. vi. 2, 7, 20, &c. [2] verse 19.
[3] In the sense of 'noticed,' 'regarded.'
[4] יְצַוֶּה; possibly implying the permanency of the injunction.

do justice and judgment'[1]—which are evidently regarded as essential or fundamental virtues—the purpose towards which this authority is to be exercised is implicitly stated; also 'the way of the LORD' is a definite course of conduct which, it is assumed, is, or can be, known to Abraham. The blessing upon Abraham's seed is contingent upon the effort to secure all these conditions.

This is one of the passages which justifies us in speaking of 'organized Christianity' being 'as old as Abraham.' For organized Christianity is the Divinely ordained instrument for the realization of the Kingdom of God,[2] the ideal state. Our Lord states, 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad';[3] and in the Epistle to the Hebrews we read of Abraham 'looking for the city having the foundations[4] whose designer and maker is God.'[5] Thus Abraham was the first founder of the ideal or Messianic commonwealth, certain of the principles of the constitution of which are expressed in this passage, another being found in the fifth commandment. We must

[1] Justice + judgment = righteousness in conduct or action.

[2] The practical recognition in the individual and society of the will of God.

[3] St. John viii. 56. Bishop Westcott points out, that ἵνα ἴδῃ may imply that the joy of Abraham may have consisted 'in the effort to see that which was foreshadowed.'

[4] Heb. xi. 10. See Note J.

[5] God is both the author of its plan and the executor of that plan.

be careful to notice that the end of Abraham's relationship to his children is the production of two primary moral virtues, justice and judgment, the doing of which is synonymous with 'keeping the way of the LORD,' which is therefore moral conduct. Morality issues only from the moral; and God is here implied to be the source of the moral life; morality is also conveyed and maintained only by moral channels and moral connections.[1] Thus the family relationships, which are the first of these, must themselves be moralized.

I pass over two centuries to the period of the Deuteronomic legislation.[2] The chief contents of the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy consist of the Ten Commandments—the essence of the Moral Law. The sixth chapter opens with the words, 'Now this is the commandment,' the thing decreed, a single comprehensive term expanded into 'the statutes and the judgments'—things permanently inscribed and decided—to which God hath decreed that every individual Israelite shall be made accustomed. This comprehensive commandment, the moral law, shall be kept from the highest possible motive—the love of Jehovah,[3] the single supreme authority, the

[1] Eph. iv. 16; cp. Col. ii. 19.

[2] For the date of Deuteronomy, see Driver's *Deuteronomy*, pp. xli ff.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. xxviii ff. (where the influence of Hosea upon Deuteronomy is shown).

source of the supreme and perfect righteousness.[1] This comprehensive commandment is now described as the words commanded, and these 'words' the Israelite is to teach diligently to, to impress upon, his children;[2] he is to talk of them when he sitteth in his house—in the midst of the family circle; and they are to be written upon the posts of his house, that God may bless his going out and coming in, that the sense of moral responsibility may be very present both inside and outside the home. There is not to be, as too often among ourselves, one moral code for the home, and another for the business or the outside work of life. But the point of the passage upon which I would here chiefly lay stress is that the intercourse between parent and child, the relationship between them, is to be governed by the law of a righteous God,[3] it is to be a moral relationship. This is the essential condition of permanent national welfare.

I would stay for a moment to ask a question. Not only here, but elsewhere in this book, it is stated that part of the duty of the parent to the

[1] 'The ethical qualities of Jehovah are frequently dwelt upon in Deuteronomy' (Driver's *Deuteronomy*, p. xxix).

[2] The value of Deuteronomy as a manual of religious education is very great; also we may notice that in it 'religion is the real ground of all moral and social order.'

[3] Naturally, the parent first represents God to the child; here is the beginning of the religious office of the parent. See pp. 185 ff.

child, part of the moral relationship between them, consists in the parent giving definite moral, which is at the same time definite religious, instruction. My question is: What proportion of parents in England to-day give such instruction to their children? What proportion even of parents who profess to believe in God do so? Surely here is one instance, a very definite one, in which the parental relationship at the present time stands in need of a much more adequate moralization.

Rather more than two centuries have passed since Deuteronomy became the law book for Israel, and now the concluding words of 'Malachi's' message to the people assert that social welfare depends upon the heart[1] of the fathers being turned to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers. This is a condition which demands very careful attention at this present time—a time of very rapid change. Is not this one chief cause of the imperfection of the parental and filial relationship to-day, that the ideas, including the moral standards, of one generation are not by any means always those of the other? But the words preceding those about turning the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to the fathers, namely the reference to 'the law[2] of

[1] Note K.

[2] On the significance of the 'Torah,' see Note S.

Moses my servant . . . even statutes and judgments,'[1] and to 'Elijah the prophet,' imply that, however much other ideas may change, the fundamental principles of morality, upon which the welfare of society in all ages and under all conditions depends, and which are revealed by God, must remain unalterable. Here, again, we cannot talk of 'progress' and 'development,' except in regard to application. The reference to the 'law' of Moses and to the 'teaching' of Elijah, which belong to two different ages (yet the substance of whose messages is assumed to be identical), must not be overlooked; for both are at one in this—their appeal to the supremacy of the Divine moral law. Here is the unchangeable bond between parents and children. 'I the LORD,' of Whose nature and will this moral law is the expression, 'change not; therefore ye, O sons of Jacob, are not consumed.'[2] Here is the fundamental condition, not only of welfare, but of life itself.

Once more we pass over an interval, probably again of about two centuries, and we come to the period when the Book of Proverbs was arranged in its present form.[3] Life has become more complex;

[1] See Note L.

[2] Mal. iii. 6. The words follow a denunciation of breaches of the moral law.

[3] On the probable date of our Book of Proverbs, see Toy, *Proverbs*, pp. xx ff. Nowack, in Hastings' *Bib. Dict.*, assigns it in its present form to about 250 B.C.

the book portrays town rather than country life; the temptations and the difficulties of life have increased. It is life under conditions not altogether unlike those under which the majority of people are living to-day. This is one reason why the practical teaching of the so-called 'Wisdom Literature' of the Bible, which mainly belongs to a later period than that to which it is traditionally assigned, demands more attention than it usually receives. Another historical parallel might be drawn. That age had a likeness to our own in the variety and extent of new influences to which those who lived in it were subject. The life and thought of the Jew had become less narrowly national. The influence of Greece was being felt. The conquests of Alexander the Great had made all parts of the civilized world more cosmopolitan. Again, it was the age of the 'individualistic' philosophies, in which stress was specially laid upon what was common to all men. These philosophies—Stoicism in particular—were to some extent destined to do for the Gentile what the Law did for the Jew in the preparation for Christianity.[1] Thought was more devoted to the narrower relationships of the individual, to the family and commercial relationships, rather than to his relationship to the State; yet, strange as at first sight the assertion may seem, this was the true

[1] Note M.

preparation for the discharge of the universal relationships, those which have to do with a man's duty to man simply as man. Thus in the Book of Proverbs and similar writings the chief stress is laid upon the duty of the individual[1] in regard to those personal relationships which are more or less universal—his or her duty as husband or wife, as parent or child, as master or servant, as buyer or seller, as teacher or taught, and, occasionally, as subject; but there is little or nothing in the book which might be termed national. Skill in the art of conduct—the true meaning of 'wisdom'[2] is the subject. And this skill is achieved by careful practice of the discharge of the ordinary relationships of life, by doing well the ordinary duties of life. It is unnecessary to insist at length upon the stress laid upon the right discharge of the family relationships in Proverbs, or of the fundamentally ethical conception of the character of those relationships. For the right performance of these duties wisdom is the chief requisite, and the source of wisdom is Divine.[3] Nowhere in Proverbs is wisdom

[1] 'In der Geschichte der Individualisierung der Religion Israels nimmt das Buch der Sprüche eine bedeutsame Stelle ein.'—Wildeboer, *Sprüche*, p. xvii.

[2] On the Biblical meaning of 'wisdom,' see my *Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul*, pp. 361 ff.

[3] On the 'Ethical' and Religious teaching of Proverbs, see Toy, pp. xi ff.

regarded as of human invention: as certainly as the Law, it is of Divine origin and of Divine ordering. Here, if anywhere, it is a case of '*universalia ante rem.*' Thus wisdom is also a theological virtue as well as a moral one.[1] Of wisdom justice is a principal factor, and together with justice go trustworthiness and kindness. Wisdom is to be the endowment of a father, and to hear or to obey[2] wisdom is the duty of the child. The instruction and the commandment of the father and the law of the mother[3]—the giving of these is to be neither neglected nor delegated—are the chief safeguards against immorality. It is the right conduct of a son that gives gladness to a father: it is the want of this which causes grief to a mother.[4] Here, again, the relationship is primarily moral. Finally, there is perhaps no more perfect picture in existence of the discharge of marital and parental responsibility, and of the blessings consequent upon this, than that in the 'alphabet for the wife, mother, and housewife' contained in the last chapter of this book, and all is founded upon the possession of the fundamental moral virtues. The good[5] wife and mother is one

[1] Prov. viii.; cp. Toy, p. xvi.

[2] The Hebrew root שָׁמַע means both to hear and to obey.

[3] Prov. i. 8; iv. 1 ff.; vi. 20 ff. [4] Prov. x. 1.

[5] Prov. xxxi. 10, חַיִל = elsewhere of women in xii. 4; xxxi. 29; Ruth iii. 11. The word 'virtuous' is too narrow; the Hebrew includes 'general capacity and moral worth.'

who combines moral worth with general capacity; she is one whose character and conduct command respect;[1] she is absolutely trustworthy,[2] thoughtful, skilful in conduct and speech, and she is kind in her dealings with all.[3] Whence is the source of this skill in conduct? It is not merely the result of practice in an art. She is one that feareth the LORD.[4]

Thus upon the stress laid in the Old Testament on a right conception of the family relationships there can be no question: neither can it be denied that we are taught again and again (both explicitly and implicitly) that the welfare of the community depends upon a proper discharge of these. Lastly, the Old Testament everywhere teaches us that these relationships are not of man's ordering. Their existence is due to the Divine wisdom. What their discharge demands cannot be supplied by man, except through Divine help received in obedience to the Divine will.[5]

II

In dealing with the teaching of the Old Testament upon the right relationship between employer and

[1] Prov. xxxi. 25. [2] Prov. xxxi. 11. [3] Prov. xxxi. 26.

[4] The reading of the second line of verse 30 has been suspected; but there is no evidence against it. The LXX of the verse differs somewhat from the Hebrew.

[5] For an excellent summary of the Old Testament teaching on this subject, see R. W. Dale, *Ephesians*, pp. 384 ff.

employed special care is necessary. We have to disentangle various forces and ideas, not only existing together, but actually conflicting one with another. The frequent alterations in the law of slavery, I think, indicate this.[1] Certainly in the Old Testament, when compared with other literatures of the old world, we have a high conception of the intrinsic worth, of the essential dignity, of man. The words 'God made man in His own image' are sufficient to show this. At the same time, compared with Christian teaching, with the issues of a belief in the Incarnation, we find an imperfect idea of personality,[2] and so of the value of the individual soul. Then throughout the Old Testament we feel the influence of certain racial characteristics —valuable if rightly directed, but evil if devoted to a wrong use. Persistency, which is, perhaps, the most characteristic quality of the Jew, is a valuable aid to success; but persistency sometimes manifests itself in the direction of driving a hard bargain. Did not Jacob, who has been termed the 'typical' Jew, try to bargain with God in his vow?[3] Yet, side by side with this bargaining spirit, there

[1] Legislation respecting slaves is found in all three codes of the Torah, viz. Exod. xxi. 1-11; Deut. xv. 12-18; Levit. xxv. 39-55; see article 'Servant' in Hastings' *Bib. Dict.*

[2] The conception grew in exilic and post-exilic times, *e.g.* in the Book of Ezekiel.

[3] Gen. xxviii. 20 ff.

is abundant evidence of a real humanitarianism, one which is particularly striking when compared with the want of it in some other nations of antiquity. By Amos it is implied that the duty of humaneness is co-extensive with the human race;[1] but inhumanity in the Israelite, who knows God, is a far greater sin than in other nations.[2] The existence of the same contradictions in conduct is sometimes remarked among the Jews to-day. No one, it is said, is kinder to his children than the average Jewish parent:[3] probably no one is more guilty of the inhumanity of the sweater; yet the philanthropy of the Jews is great. Is not the cost of the Jewish poor to the community relatively very small?

In this part of our subject it will, again, be found best to turn to the early chapters of Genesis, where so many ruling principles are stated. Upon the subject of work two conceptions are at once found: First (before the Fall), that work is natural to man; also that man's work is necessary to the maintenance and fulfilment of God's purpose.[4] This, I say, is the conception which precedes the Fall. Secondly (after the Fall), work is still

[1] Amos i. 3, 6, 9, 11, &c.

[2] Amos ii. 6; cp. iii. 2.

[3] The infant mortality among Jews in England is far less than among other sections of the population.

[4] Gen. ii. 5, 8, 15, 19, 20.

considered a necessity, but now a painful one.[1] It is regarded as exhausting and laborious, and is accompanied by disappointments and vexations. Sin has entered into this, as into other spheres of man's life, and spoiled it. By sin, which produces human wilfulness, work has become embittered. We shall do well to keep these two conceptions in mind: first, that work is under all conditions necessary, yet is not essentially an evil; secondly, that through sin, which vitiates everything into which it enters (whether essentially evil or not), work, as toil, has come to be regarded as an evil.

Next we must remember the universality of slavery in the old world. Society, then, was inconceivable without it. Yet throughout the Old Testament there is an undercurrent of protest against it. Here we see the strongest proof of an underlying, but as yet inarticulate, sense of the value of the individual;[2] which, as I have already stated, is the same as a conviction of the inherent dignity of man. Slavery is not only a state to be shunned, it is an evil to be mitigated. The proof of this lies

[1] Gen. iii. 17 ff. The same word in Hebrew is translated 'sorrow' (*bis*) in verse 16, and 'toil' in verse 17: the root עצב = to hurt, pain, grieve; in both verses the LXX has λύπη.

[2] We see in the Bible the growth of an idea which was elsewhere absent in the old world—'a true idea of the individuality of man; an adequate conception of him as an independent person' (see Dean Church, *The Discipline of the Christian Character*, pp. 10 ff.).

in the many laws enacted for the protection of slaves, and for the limitation of the period of slavery. Doubtless there were times when the administration of these servile laws was more satisfactory than it was at other times. The memory of the national slavery in Egypt was never effaced; and it was in the words, 'Remember that thou wast a slave in Egypt,'[1] that one reason was given for the observance of the Sabbath, the day of 'ceasing'[2] from labour. The Sabbath was a perpetual witness to the blessing, as well as to the intrinsic right, of freedom.

We cannot say that, as time proceeded, the condition of either the poor[3] or the slave continuously improved. Actually it seems to have been the opposite.[4] In one respect Old Testament history shows a striking likeness to very modern history—to that of our own time.[5] An increase of national wealth, even of so-called national prosperity, did not then, any more than now, mean a universal improvement in the lot of the poor. Increase of wealth, then as now, too often meant making the fullest

[1] Deut. v. 15.

[2] The fundamental meaning of שָׁבַת.

[3] Previous to the age of the monarchy the Israelites seem to have been largely a nation of small freeholders (this is the key to the story of Naboth's vineyard).

[4] 1 Sam. viii. (whatever its date) contains a protest against the new conditions under the monarchy.

[5] Note N.

possible use of every increased opportunity for 'exploiting' the labour of the poor.[1] Then, as now, the necessity of the poor was frequently the opportunity of those better off—an opportunity too often used without mercy.

It would not be too much to say that the chief burden of the message of the prophets is the iniquity of the oppression of the poor by the rich. Our Lord's saying about its being difficult for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God might be regarded as a general corollary drawn from their teaching. We have only to think of the appeals of Amos and Micah[2] on behalf of the poor, of their denunciations of those who oppressed them. They constantly assert what is as true to-day as then, that luxury on the part of some implies poverty as the lot of many.[3] Their conviction that poverty, which is a form of weakness, is not only frequently the result of oppression, but is also a temptation to oppress, is written across their writings. Hosea's message from God is as clear as that of Amos or Micah, 'I love mercy';[4] yet 'Ephraim is a

[1] For a vivid picture of evil results of recent industrial developments, see the chapter entitled 'The Present Crisis' in Rauschenbusch's *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, pp. 211 ff.

[2] *e.g.* Amos ii. 6 ff. (the second clause of verse 7 is in the R.V. probably a mistranslation); iv. 1; v. 11, &c. Micah ii. 2; iii. 2; vi. 10 ff., &c.

[3] For a proof of this see Urwick's *Luxury and the Waste of Life*.

[4] Hosea vi. 6 (the essential idea of חֶסֶד is that of a moral bond).

trafficker, the balances of deceit are in his hand, he loveth to oppress.'[1] Isaiah's message to the men of Judah is 'relieve the oppressed';[2] his description of Jerusalem in evil straits is 'the people shall be oppressed,' not by a foreign enemy, but 'everyone by another and everyone by his neighbour';[3] his picture of the luxuriousness of the daughters of *Z*ion assumes the methods whereby this luxury is made possible.[4]

So much for the prophets of the eighth century. The message of those who prophesied a century later is the same. Listen to Jeremiah, 'Execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor: and do no wrong, do no violence, to the stranger, the fatherless, nor the widow':[5] 'Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by injustice; that useth his neighbour's service without wages' [or with insufficient 'sweated' ones] and giveth him not his hire.'[6] 'Ye have not hearkened unto me, to proclaim liberty, every man to his brother, and every man to his neighbour: behold, I proclaim unto you a liberty, saith the LORD, to the sword, and to the pestilence, and to the famine.'[7] The message of *Z*ephaniah[8] is the same, but, instead of quoting

[1] Hosea xii. 7.
[2] Isa. i. 17.
[3] Isa. iii. 5.
[4] Isa. iii. 16 ff.
[5] Jer. xxii. 3 ff.
[6] Jer. xxii. 13 ff.
[7] Jer. xxxiv. 17.
[8] Zeph. i. 12 ff.

his well-known words, I ask you to listen to this comment by one of our ablest and most spiritual Old Testament scholars: 'Here is evidently the same public temper which at all periods provokes alike the despair of the reformer and the indignation of the prophet: the criminal apathy of the well-to-do classes sunk in ease and religious indifference. We have to-day the same mass of obscure, nameless persons, who oppose their almost unconquerable inertia to every movement of reform and are the drag upon all vital and progressive religion.'[1] Ezekiel adds his testimony to that of the other prophets: 'The people of the land have used oppression, and exercised robbery; yea, they have vexed the poor and needy . . . and I sought for a man among them that should make up the hedge, and stand in the gap before Me for the land, that I should not destroy it: but I found none.'[2] There is an identical charge and an identical warning of the consequences in Nahum[3] and Habakkuk,[4] for oppression is oppression, and its consequences will be the same whether it occurs in Jerusalem or Nineveh or Babylon, or in London or New York. Human nature has the same feelings in all; in all hunger and exhausting toil are equally hard to bear. In short, we may say that the message of the

[1] Note O.
[2] Ezek. xxii. 29 f.
[3] Nah. ii. 11 ff.
[4] Hab. ii. 6, 9, 12, &c.

prophets is essentially a moral-social one: it is moral because it is social, and social because it is moral.[1] The prophets were before everything else social teachers and social reformers. They were always the champions of the oppressed; they always appealed for justice. Their insight into actual conditions revealed the absence of social health:[2] the want of this, they proclaimed, must inevitably issue in social disaster.[3] Among the chief causes and worst symptoms of social unhealth is the absence of justice, the primary moral relationship, and also of judgment, the public official decree, which is to issue in justice.[4] The absence of justice, the Bible everywhere teaches us, is the certain precursor of social ruin.

There is one period of Old Testament history in which the relationship between buyer and seller, employer and employed, richer and poorer seems to have become peculiarly evil. And it was a period in which there were special reasons why everything

[1] One proof of the identity of 'moral' and 'social' as adjectives is to think of 'justice,' which is an essential, indeed the chief, factor in both morality and sociality.

[2] Ezek. xxxiv. 4.

[3] There is no message which needs to be more clearly insisted upon to-day than that social evil must end in social ruin. The sequence of cause and effect is as certain in the moral and social as in the physical sphere. Amos iii. 6.

[4] The immense importance and responsibility of this is taught in Deut. i. 17: 'The judgment is God's.'

that was possible should be done to prevent internal social unhealth. It was also a period of which we can speak with more than ordinary clearness; because of its social evils we seem to have at least three independent witnesses. I would have all those who to-day are trying to improve the relationship between employer and employed, or the wider relationship between buyer and seller, or even between richer and poorer, to read, first, the fifth chapter of Nehemiah; secondly, the fifty-sixth to the fifty-ninth chapters of Isaiah;[1] and thirdly, the third chapter of 'Malachi,'[2] all of which probably refer to the conditions which existed in Jerusalem and Judæa in the middle of the fifth century, about a hundred years after the first return from Babylon. We must remember that these conditions were existing, not in an ordinary 'component' society, but in a 'constituent' or purposive society—in other words, as Bishop Westcott said, among the members of 'a Church,'[3] among the members of a body the very reason for whose existence was to bear witness to a higher life. The ideal life and purpose of the returned community—that of a witness to the nations—had been pictured in glowing terms by

[1] About the date of these chapters we cannot, of course, speak dogmatically. See Note P.

[2] See Professor Driver's introduction to 'Malachi' in the *Century Bible, Minor Prophets*, vol. ii. pp. 287 ff.

[3] *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 54.

Isaiah of Babylon. It was the social or rather anti-social life of the richer members of this community which, as Nehemiah tells them, had brought the community itself into reproach among the heathen.[1] What a warning is here for ourselves, who also belong to a purposive society, a society whose actual moral and social witness is often far from being as clear as it might be![2] The welfare of the returned exiles in the days of Nehemiah is depicted for us as threatened by two dangers: first, laxity with regard to marriage; secondly, an entire forgetfulness of humanitarian feelings, that is, of the fundamental moral considerations in the treatment of the poor by the rich.[3] The charge of all the three witnesses I have mentioned is identical, and is the same as that of Amos—it is the want of humanity; the social relationships are not governed by the essential higher-human, or ethical standards.[4] The two prophetic writers—'Malachi' and the so-called 'Trito-Isaiah'—assert, as did the earlier prophets, that this conduct will inevitably bring

[1] Neh. v. 9 (see Ryle *in loc.*).

[2] See a Report of Convocation, *The Moral Witness of the Church on Economic Subjects* (to be obtained from the S.P.C.K.). It is strange that in this there is no reference to Neh. v.!

[3] Neh. v. 2 ff.

[4] The happy results of a more humane treatment of the poor and the oppressed, and the utter uselessness of a mere formal and ceremonial religious worship, are vividly expressed in Isa. lviii. 8 ff.

about the judgment of God. Here once more the Old Testament teaches us that social welfare depends upon the moralizing or humanizing of the social relationships.

I might also add in a true and very special sense, 'upon their being Christianized,' and for this reason: Beneath and behind all the teaching of the prophets is their vision (for they were seers) of the ideal, the 'Messianic,' society in contrast to the actual nation of Israel, in the midst of which they were giving their witness for God.[1] They were constantly confronted by the immense moral chasm which separated the life around them from that Messianic State which, they felt, Israel was called to realize. If this was so before the Captivity, it was still more so after the sifting of the nation by the exile and the return. The 'Servant' passages in the latter part of the Book of Isaiah bear witness to this. The progressive narrowing or limiting of the conception of the Servant, of the one upon whom the charge was laid and the hope was centred, shows the prophet's disappointment.[2] The moral qualities which the prophets saw to be needed for the establishment of the ideal or Messianic State, or for the fulfilment of the Servant's work, are identical, and are just those moral qualities which

[1] Isa. lviii. 10 ff. ; lix. 1, 16 ff.

[2] See my *Social Teaching of St. Paul*, pp. 58 ff.

are pre-eminent in the character of the historic Christ, and which were expressed in His relationships with those around Him. They are righteousness and love, justice and mercy, truth and purity, faithfulness and tenderness—in a word, they are conformity with the revealed character and will of God. It is all this which in reference to the Old Testament, as well as to the New, justifies us in identifying the moralization of the social relationships with their being more perfectly 'Christianized.'

III

The next relationship claiming our attention is that between pastor and flock, between the religious leader or teacher and the people. An adequate treatment of the Old Testament ideals of this relationship, and of the way in which it was actually discharged (as these are described in various books belonging to different ages) would involve an inquiry into the various conceptions of the priestly[1] and prophetic functions which these contain; also into the manner in which these functions were in fact discharged, that is into the nature of the actual relations which existed between those who filled the priestly and prophetic offices and those towards

[1] See Hastings' *Bib. Dict.*, article 'Priests and Levites,' vol. iv. pp. 67 ff.

whom these men had a far-reaching responsibility. The assertion sometimes made, that the Old Testament priesthood was only very secondarily concerned with morality or conduct—as was certainly the case with some heathen priesthoods—is not borne out by the contents of the Old Testament itself.[1] There, as elsewhere, it is the conception of God which rules the conception of the work of His special servants; because as we conceive of God so do we conceive of religion, and consequently of worship—the expression of religion.[2] The work of atonement between a moral God and His worshippers, which in its fullest sense is the work of both priest and prophet, involves that of the removal of sin, the cause of separation. The putting away of sin must surely be the most moral of all tasks. And the Old Testament shows how strong is the tendency in the religious leader, in both priest and prophet, for the moral to fall into the background.[3] The temptation of the priest is to discharge his office more or less mechanically: the temptation of the prophet is to tune his utterances to what is acceptable to the people rather than to what their moral condition and social circumstances demand.[4]

[1] See Note Q.

[2] 'As the deity is, the faith that is built on him must be. Find out the character of the deity, and you find out the character of the religion' (Dr. A. M. Fairbairn, *Religion in History*, p. 19).

[3] Note R. [4] Isa. xxx. 10; Jer. vi. 14; xxviii. 9, &c.

As early as the eleventh century it is the immoralities of Hophni and Phinehas,[1] and the want of moral earnestness on the part of Eli,[2] which cause the removal from office of that line of the priesthood.[3] The priesthood must be faithful to 'do'[4]—a word which can hardly be interpreted of mere mechanical performance of certain ceremonies—according to all that is in the Divine heart and mind, that is according to the essential purpose of God, which is certainly a *moral* purpose. Three centuries later, during a period of more than ordinary moral obliquity, comes the terrible indictment of Hosea, directed against priest and prophet alike: 'There is no troth,[5] nor loyal love,[6] nor knowledge of God in the land. . . . Yet let none find fault and none upbraid, for my people are but as their priestlings.[7] O priest, thou hast stumbled to-day, and stumble to-night shall the prophet with thee, and I will destroy thy mother (the nation).[8] My people are (or will be) destroyed for lack of

[1] 1 Sam. ii. 22 ff. [2] 1 Sam. iii. 13.

[3] 1 Sam. ii. 35.

[4] 1 Sam. ii. 35.

[5] Hosea iv. 4 ff. אֱמֶת = faithfulness, trustworthiness.

[6] חֶסֶד = *pietas* = 'dutiful love as it shows itself in acts of kindliness and loyal affection' (Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, p. 160).

[7] See G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve*, vol. i. p. 257; so also Harper *in loc.*

[8] *Ibid.* Harper thinks it means 'the clan of the priests.'

knowledge:[1] because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me; and as thou hast forgotten the Torah[2] of thy God, I, even I, will forget thy children.'

A century later we have the fine ideal of the priesthood in the thirty-third chapter of Deuteronomy—the disinterested spirit in which the true priest discharges his office, his strict obedience to the will of Jehovah, his careful observance of the covenant; he teaches[3] Jacob God's judgment,[4]—in other words, he gives decisions strictly in obedience to God's decisions; he also instructs Israel according to God's direction.[5] We must notice here how the teaching office, the office of the moral and religious instructor, is placed *before* that of the ceremonialist.[6]

Yet another two centuries pass, and we are again in the time of Nehemiah, the evil social conditions of which we have already noticed. The second chapter of 'Malachi' contains the strongest possible indictment of the priests for their neglect of moral and intellectual teaching. May not this

[1] *i.e.* of God. [2] See Note S.

[3] Literally 'directs' (יוֹרוּ in verse 10).

[4] Probably the customs or usages of the religion of Jehovah, originally given by Him.

[5] Torah. See Note S.

[6] The second part of Deut. xxxiii. 10 speaks of the putting of incense before God, and of whole burnt-offering upon His altar.

neglect have been one among other causes of the evil social and moral conditions then existing? Can we conceive of a stronger rebuke than this, 'Ye are turned aside out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble by direction?'[1] The priests had evidently made no appeal to the best and highest in the character of the people: their lips had not kept knowledge, and in vain had the people sought instruction, either moral or intellectual, from them; they had failed to recognize that they were called to be messengers[2] charged with a revelation from the LORD of Hosts. There is no indictment or warning in the whole range of Holy Scripture to which at the present time we ought to pay more careful attention than to this.[3]

Upon the responsibility of the *prophets* for the moral instruction and guidance of the people there is surely no need to enlarge; and we must remember that it is primarily the prophetic order and the prophetic function which has been perpetuated in the Christian ministry. For the priest to fail to be a moral and an intellectual influence was more than sufficiently serious; for the prophet to do this was

[1] Mal. ii. 8. In verse 7 we have the ideal of the priest, in verse 8 the actual contrasted with this. Notice also the turning aside of the priests themselves precedes wrong 'direction' to the people; 'direction' is, of course, here, again, *torah*.

[2] Mal. ii. 7. The word for messenger is, of course, 'Malachi' (the word is once used of a prophet, Haggai i. 13).

[3] Note T.

to deny the whole reason for his existence. Yet, again and again, in times when the moral and social conditions of the people were specially evil, the prophets are denounced for faithlessness to their vocation. Insight[1] and courage are essential qualifications for the discharge of the prophetic office: insight into the character of God and into the needs of men, courage to utter without fear or favour what may be revealed to him.[2] For want of either the prophet is again and again denounced, and especially for want of courage. The prophet is constantly tempted to keep silence when he ought to rebuke the sins now of one class, now of another. He may pander to either the weaknesses or the interests of either rulers or people. He may 'prophesy smooth things,' even deceits.[3] He may lack the dauntless courage of Micaiah, and 'give good words' to those in authority, or he may in the ears of the people say 'peace, peace, when there is no peace.' It is when the prophets, instead of witnessing for righteousness, strengthen the hands of evil-doers, 'so that none doth return from his wickedness,[4] it is then that Jeremiah sees in Jerusalem 'a horrible thing.' And what is his

[1] Insight is the key to foresight: the prophet was essentially a 'seer.'

[2] 1 Kings xxii. 14; Isa. l. 7; Ezek. ii. 6; iii. 9; &c.

[3] Jer. v. 30, 31; vi. 13, 14.

[4] Jer. xxiii. 14.

exhortation to the prophet that hath God's word? Is it not to speak that word faithfully, for is not that 'word as fire, and as a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces'?[1] If the relation between the prophet and God is not one of absolute fidelity,[2] if the relation between the prophet and the people is not one of absolute loyalty to truth, there issues a famine of that without which the higher life cannot exist—'a famine of hearing the words of the LORD.'[3]

The prophets are the great social teachers and the great social reformers of the Bible.[4] Their value to us in this matter is chiefly twofold: They had the vision of an ideal commonwealth; they were convinced that righteousness was the one and only means by which this could be established. They also saw that righteousness—a quality of Divine origin—meant right relations with God and between men. It is their conviction of this, and the fearlessness with which they proclaimed it, that makes them such invaluable teachers for us to-day.

[1] Jer. xxiii. 29.

[2] Would anyone dare to assert that the 'moral witness' (which is surely the Divine witness) of the Church of England, even in recent years, has been as clear, as fearless, and as comprehensive as it might have been? What of her backwardness to speak out fearlessly in the cause of 'Temperance'?

[3] Amos viii. 11.

[4] Note U.

IV

In dealing with the Old Testament teaching upon the relationship of the citizen to the State and of the State to the citizen, we must remember that to the Israelite the State was a theocratic institution, its constitution and its law were alike regarded as of Divine origin, as due solely to the will of God. Hence the ideal relationship of the citizen to the State was one of entire and unquestioning obedience to this Divine law.[1] This obedience was the primary, indeed the sole condition of social welfare. Similarly, the primary duty of the State to the citizen was to see that he enjoyed all the liberty[2] and all the privileges which the Divine law claimed for him. Compared with that of other States of the ancient world the constitution of Israel was democratic. The appointment of a king was regarded by Samuel as a downward step, as an assimilation to the lower standards of the nations.[3] This assimilation proceeded rapidly during the reigns of David and Solomon; witness the maintenance of a luxurious court, of a large standing army, and of the heavy taxation which these involved. The prophets were always the champions of democratic rights and liberties against the absolutism of the

[1] Note V. [2] Note W. [3] 1 Sam. viii. 4 ff.

kings. When do we find a prophet on the side of the ruler against the people? Ahijah the Shilonite was the moving force against Rehoboam; Elijah was the champion of the small freeholders of whom Naboth was an example; the overthrow of the house of Omri was due to Elisha and his school. Throughout the Old Testament the rights of the Israelite, however poor or oppressed he may have been, are asserted. Every member of the nation or commonwealth is equal before God. He is a subject of Jehovah with a personal relation to Him before he is a subject of the reigning king. But with the possession and assertion of rights must go the practical recognition of responsibilities. The Israelite's first responsibility was obedience to the law. Upon this the favour of Jehovah, not only to the individual, but to the community depended.[1] Obedience to the law was the measure of patriotism and good citizenship. Neither the word 'citizen' nor the word 'patriot' occurs in the English versions of the Old Testament, nor, so far as I know, is there any exact equivalent to them in Hebrew; yet no one can read the Old Testament, from the story of Achan or the song of Deborah down to those psalms which may belong to the age of the Maccabees,[2] without feeling that, if any one nation or people more than

[1] Deut. vi. 1 ff.; viii. 1 ff., &c.
[2] *e.g.* Pss. lxxiv., lxxix.

another ever knew what patriotism meant or what good citizenship implied, Israel was that nation and the Jews were that people. One has only to read a few chapters of the *Republic* of Plato or of the *Politics* of Aristotle, and then a few chapters of Isaiah, Deuteronomy, and the Psalms, in order to feel the immense moral superiority of the Hebrew ideals of citizenship, and to see that the Bible writers have got far nearer to the root of the matter than have the Greek philosophers. What makes the Old Testament teaching upon the duties and responsibilities of citizenship so superior to other old-world teaching on the same subject is, strange to say, its indirectness. These duties and responsibilities depend upon another duty and responsibility—that due to God, that which must be rendered to God. He always stands before and above the State. The claims of God, that is of righteousness, of the highest morality, must always precede any utilitarian considerations however enticing, any temporal advantages however apparently great. It is 'righteousness' alone that 'exalteth a nation.'[1] And the means whereby national or civic prosperity is to be accomplished, being character-forming processes, are as important as the end.

It is here that the Old Testament teaching upon citizenship and patriotism needs pressing home

[1] Prov. xiv. 34; xvi. 12.

to-day, namely that what we term politics are not merely to be *connected* with religion, they are a *part* of religion.[1] Our danger lies in their divorce. Isaiah was both a great citizen and a great patriot. 'His political advice was conspicuous not only for its religiousness but for what we should term its worldly-wisdom.'[2] Isaiah certainly would not have understood the distinction we are accustomed to make. To him political prudence was part of religion. 'The LORD of hosts is for a spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment, and for strength to them that turn back the battle to the gate.'[3]

Amos, again, was a great patriot. As he contemplates the impending destruction of Samaria, he sees that it is immorality of every kind that has been her undoing. 'The havoc is the moral havoc. . . . The rich are indifferent to it; they have wealth, art, and [what they would regard as] patriotism and religion, but they have neither heart for the poverty nor conscience for the sin of their people. We know their kind! They are always with us. . . . They have their political zeal and will rally to an election when the interests of their class or their trade are in danger. They have a robust and exuberant

[1] Cp. Note U.
[2] G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. i. pp. 213 f.
[3] Isa. xxviii. 6.

patriotism, they talk grandly of commerce, empire, and the national destiny; but for the real woes and sores of the people, the poverty, the over-work, the drunkenness, the dissoluteness, which more affect a nation's life than anything else, they have no pity and no care.'[1]

Jeremiah was, possibly, the truest and greatest patriot in the Old Testament. If, when he beholds the miseries of Jerusalem, he cries, 'Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night,'[2] his grief is explained by the fact that its citizens are 'faithless' men.[3] Not in accordance with faithfulness—an essential condition of civic and national power—are they mighty in the land; instead, 'they proceed from evil to evil.' Then in the final words we have revealed the whole secret of the trouble—'they know not' (they do not recognize) 'Me, saith Jehovah.' I have surely said enough to prove my thesis, that so far as the Old Testament teaching upon the responsibilities of citizenship is concerned —social welfare depends on the moralizing of this, as of other relationships. And remember that here, as always, moralizing means Christianizing. The prophets, as I have already pointed out, were

[1] G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. i. p. 175.

[2] Jer. ix. 1 ff.

[3] בֹּגְדִים; LXX, ἀθετούντων, men who disregard fidelity.

of all men those who saw most clearly behind the actual the ideal; behind the actual citizenship of Samaria or Jerusalem they beheld the ideal, the Messianic, the Christian citizenship and State. Again and again they picture for us the ideal commonwealth, *τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν*. Amos and Hosea, Micah and the Isaianic writers, Ezekiel and Zechariah, all have given us glimpses of that city upon which they gazed. And in every case it is implied that the enjoyment of the life of this city depends upon the practice of those virtues to which we rightly apply the term Christian. It was, they realized, the want of these virtues which had been the undoing of Israel; in the cultivation, possession, and exercise of these virtues shall be the means of her restoration and glorifying. For what is Christianity but moral likeness to, and moral communion with, God? And is not personal knowledge of Him, intimate communion with Him, the one condition always implied in the realization of the Messianic State?

The Messianic people is but the 'extension' of the Messianic king; their character, their virtues, and their conduct must be the reproduction of His. Like Him they must be inspired with wisdom, understanding, counsel, strength of will towards goodness, knowledge of, and reverence for, God; they must not decide after the hearing of the ear;

but with righteousness they must judge the poor and with equity reprove for the meek of the earth.[1] What, I ask once more, are all these virtues but the virtues expressed in the historic life of Jesus, Who is at once the Christ of history and the Christ of experience?

V

The last relationship I considered in the previous lecture was that of State to State, of nation to nation, of people to people. It is sometimes asserted that if there is any one branch of ethics more than another in which we may claim that progress has been made, it is in international ethics. We are often reminded that in the old world there was one code of ethics for a man's relation to a fellow-countryman, another for his relation to a foreigner;[2] also that war was of much more common occurrence in the old world than it is now; that the history of a nation then consisted largely in its record of successful or unsuccessful wars. All this may be true. At the same time, again and again in the Old Testament we are taught to regard war, with its attendant miseries, as a punishment sent by God, and

[1] Isa. xi. 2 ff.

[2] *e.g.* Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. xxxi; for a loftier view, see G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. i. chap. xvii.

therefore as implying the existence of sin.[1] War is a scourge in the hand of God; yet, more often than not, the particular instrument He employs is destroyed,[2] if not in the very using, at least within a short time afterwards. Assyria conquers and falls;[3] Babylon does the same;[4] the conquests of David bring no lasting good; the results of the victories over Syria are ultimately disastrous, at least to the moral soundness of Israel.[5] No Old Testament writer has a wider international outlook than Amos. You remember the wonderful survey of the nations with which his book opens, and the wars to which he briefly alludes? What better title could we give to these first two chapters than 'The issues of a want of humanity,' which with him is synonymous with a want of morality? The wars and conquests, either past or impending, of which he speaks are one and all judgments upon disregard for the need of moralizing or humanizing the various social relationships. Cruelty, oppression, luxury, lust, and an inadequate sense of the value of human

[1] *e.g.* Ezek. xiv. 21, where 'the sword' is the first of God's 'sore judgments.' On a change of view in regard to war in the Old Testament, see article 'War' in Hastings' *Bib. Dict.*

[2] St. Matt. xxvi. 52.

[3] Nahum ii. 3 ff.

[4] Isa. xiv. 3–23.

[5] The oppression of the poor by the rich and the luxury which Amos denounces were the results of the increase of wealth due to these victories.

life (as in the twice-mentioned slave trade of Edom)[1] are the sins specially rebuked. They are the causes, the accompaniments, the issues of war.[2]

On the other hand, the value and the blessings of peace are nowhere more clearly portrayed than in the Old Testament. Peace is one of the chief blessings of the Messianic or ideal State,[3] and, especially in the earlier prophets, as we have seen, a moral, which is a social, reformation is an essential preliminary condition for its establishment. Peace is always a *consequent* state or blessing: 'The work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and confidence for ever.'[4] Elsewhere we find knowledge of God, peace, righteousness, and freedom closely joined together.[5] It is the One Who shepherds his people in the strength of Jehovah Who is the author of their peace.[6] And in a great Messianic psalm[7] it is righteousness and peace that are depicted as embracing each other.

It is not for us to find excuses for wars of extermination, for the slaughter of the Amalekites, for the wholesale butcheries of Jehu. It is much more for us to remember 'that they that take the sword

[1] Amos i. 6, 9. [2] Note W.
[3] Isa. ii. 4 (probably repeated from Micah iv. 1-3); ix. 6, &c.
[4] Isa. xxxii. 17. [5] Isa. liv. 13 ff.
[6] Micah v. 5 (see Cheyne and G. A. Smith *in loc.*).
[7] Ps. lxxxv. 10.

shall perish by the sword.' So long, but only so long, as human nature is what it is, will huge fleets and standing armies be necessary. Every warship and every regiment is a witness to the imperfection of human nature and of our social relationships. But Christ came into the world to change human nature, and the object of every Christian must be to further His purpose. So long as envy and jealousy and greed are allowed to rule, so long must those who are ruled by these qualities arm themselves to the teeth. So long as luxury and oppression flourish, so long as unhealthy internal conditions exist, so long must nations harbouring these evils be a prey to others.

The testimony of the Old Testament—the Bible of Christ and His first followers and to which He constantly appealed for guidance upon conduct[1]—is clear.

To the Christian to-day the Old Testament is still one of the two greatest philosophies of history; for it portrays the life of all the various societies it describes—their evolution, their growth or their decay—as subject to Divine inexorable laws, of which those of love and justice, faithfulness and mercy, truth and purity and temperance are the chief. It portrays individuals and societies rebelling

[1] *e.g.* St. Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10, &c.

against, breaking (if you will) these laws, which may be regarded as the Divinely appointed conditions upon obedience to which all social welfare depends. But remember, this rebellion is always ultimately at the cost of both individual and social welfare. The results may not be immediate; on the contrary, they may seem to us now, as they have seemed to others in the past, to be strangely deferred. Still, in the past they have arrived, and, unless we remove their causes, they will again arrive in the near or distant future.

Whether we consider the relationships of the family, or those of capital and labour, or those of pastor and people, of citizen and State, or of one State to another, to one and all the same principles apply. There are said to be those who doubt the utility of the Old Testament, who doubt whether it can with advantage be preached to-day, who believe that we can no longer profitably appeal to its teaching. Those who think thus are, I am sure, entirely wrong. The ethical teaching, like the ethical standards, of the Old Testament varies. Much of it we must without hesitation condemn, just as our Lord quite clearly condemned it.[1] Much of it, on the other hand, still remains for us, as it was to Him, the best and surest foundation to which we can appeal for rule and guidance in life and conduct.

[1] *e.g.* St. Matt. v. 21, 27, 33, 36, &c.

There have been periods in the history of Christianity when great moral and social reformers have felt that there was no more useful fundamental and elementary authority to which they could appeal. Let me remind you of one. In the midst of the semi-pagan reaction which invaded Italy in the latter half of the fifteenth century—a reaction marked by an almost incredible relaxation of morals and by an almost entire contempt for the sanctity of all social relationships and social responsibilities —God raised up in Florence, the very centre of this reaction, a prophet, Savonarola by name. It was a true instinct which led Savonarola, when he saw how the very foundations of social stability were rocking, when he saw the moral corruption and social unhealth which surrounded him—it was, I say, a true instinct which led him in his famous sermons from the pulpit of the Duomo to turn for inspiration to the prophets of the Old Testament.[1]

To-day the Divine law and the Divine messages of the prophets are being practically ignored in our social relationships, and that by men and women who actually call themselves Christians. Conse-

[1] One great point of likeness in Savonarola to the Hebrew prophets was his passionate pleading for the poor. 'Christ did not say, Ye built Me not fine churches, nor fine convents. He did but exhort you to works of charity: therefore by charity shall all things be renewed' (from a sermon on Haggai). See Villari's *Life and Times of Savonarola*, p. 260.

quently, and no wonder, Christianity does not flourish: there is in the lives of such people no stable foundation upon which Christianity can be built. The Law and the Prophets were not to be abrogated, but to be fulfilled by Christianity. How can you fulfil that which in your daily conduct you ignore? We must point these men and women, as Savonarola pointed the citizens of Florence, to the Old Testament, where the claim of the elementary social virtues is asserted. To-day in thousands of English parishes evil social conditions, the result of wrong social relationships and undischarged social responsibilities, are hindering the work of Christ. In order to drag to light, to call by their true names, and to make every effort to abolish these conditions, we require the moral insight and the dauntless courage of the Hebrew prophets—the men through whom God spake in the days of old, and through whose undying words He is still speaking to us now.

NOTES TO LECTURE II

NOTE A. *The Appeal to the Highest in Man.* 'In all considerations of social work and social problems there is one main thing which it is important to remember—that the mind is the man. If we are clear about this great fact . . . we have an unfailing test to apply to any scheme of social reformation. . . . Does it appeal to men's minds? Not merely to their momentary needs, or appetites, or fancies, but to the higher powers of affection, thought, and reasonable action? . . . The necessity for this appeal has, of course, never been entirely lost sight of. . . . Leaders like Cromwell, who insisted that you could not even make a good soldier of a man without appealing to his higher qualities, owe their success to their profound knowledge of human nature. Great religious teachers, who have put their faith in spiritual conviction and conversion, who have refused to accept anything short of the whole man, have achieved results which seem miraculous to those who are willing to compromise for a share in the souls they undertake to guide' (Mrs. Bosanquet, *The Strength of the People*, pp. 1–3).

NOTE B. *Our Lord's Knowledge of Man.* 'All the Evangelists agree in representing the Lord as moving among men with a complete and certain knowledge of their characters and needs. . . . A careful study seems to show beyond doubt that the knowledge of Christ, so far as it was the discernment of the innermost meaning of that which from time to time was presented to Him, and so far as it was an understanding of things as they

are, has its analogues in human powers. His knowledge appears to be truly the knowledge of the Son of Man, and not merely the knowledge of the Divine Word, though at each moment and in each connection it was, in virtue of His perfect humanity, relatively complete' (Westcott, *St. John*, p. 46). If we notice the words 'perfect humanity' here, we have a most valuable lesson for the social reformer. One of the chief factors in our Lord's perfect humanity was His perfect sympathy. This sympathy cannot be either present or expressed when our social relationship to those we would help is wrong, *i.e.* when it is not thoroughly human, which here is seen to be synonymous with 'Christian.'

NOTE C. *The Influence of Christianity upon Character.* 'What needs admitting, or rather proclaiming, by agnostics who would be just, is, that the Christian doctrine has a power of cultivating and developing saintliness which has had no equal in any other creed or philosophy. When it gets firm hold of a promising subject, one with a heart and a head, warm and strong enough to grasp its full import and scope, then it strengthens the will, raises and purifies the affections, and finally achieves a conquest over the baser self in man, of which the result is a character none the less beautiful and soul-subduing because it is wholly beyond imitation by the less spiritually endowed' (J. Cotter Morrison, *The Service of Man*, p. 145). I have purposely chosen as unsympathetic a witness as I could find. The writer does not explain the origin or condition of 'promising subjects,' or of those 'spiritually endowed.' Will any man—scholar, artist, scientist, philanthropist—receive the best from that in which he has no faith?

NOTE D. *Abraham and the Christian Society.* It was not as if Abraham merely *saw* the vision of the ideal society, he *acted* upon his vision; and so far as he was able, by obeying the call, by separating himself in faith and life from his contemporaries, by the care he took in the choice of a wife for Isaac, &c., he wrought towards its consummation. The three words 'Christian,' 'Messianic,' and 'ideal' may be regarded as synonymous. They must be so interpreted if the unity of the Bible is to be maintained, and if its social teaching is to be adequately understood. See my *Social Teaching of St. Paul*, pp. 72 f., 92 f. Bishop Westcott (on Heb. xi. 10) says: 'The visible Jerusalem was farther from this spiritual archetype' [the city that hath the foundations] 'than the tents of the patriarchs.' Also (on St. John viii. 56), he quotes the Jewish tradition, that 'Abraham saw the whole history of his descendants in the mysterious vision recorded in Gen. xv. 8 ff.'

NOTE E. *The Christian Church in the True or Direct Succession.* Dr. Hort, commenting on St. Matt. xvi. 18, writes: 'If we may venture for a moment to substitute the name Israel, and read the words as "on this rock I will build my Israel," we gain an impression which supplies at least an approximation to the probable sense. . . . What He declared He would build was in one sense old, in another new. It had a true continuity with the Ecclesia of the Old Covenant; the building of it would be a *re*-building' (*The Christian Ecclesia*, pp. 10 f.). When in Gal. vi. 16 St. Paul speaks of 'the Israel of God,' he refers to the whole body of believers, the spiritual Israel. In Phil. iii. 3 he asserts, 'we are the circumcision who . . . glory in Christ Jesus.'

Dr. Lightfoot, commenting on 'the saints' in Phil. i. 1, writes: 'The Christian Church having taken the place of the Jewish race' [or rather Jewish 'Church'?] 'has inherited all its titles and privileges.' See also Dr. Hort on διασπορᾶς in 1 Pet. i. 1, also on 1 Pet. i. 2, also on ii. 9, where he speaks of 'The Christian Church, the new Israel,' and of St. Peter's anxiety 'to claim afresh for Christian use the idea, which in various forms is so prominent in the Old Testament, of a community of men who do in a special sense belong to the Lord of the whole earth.' See also Sanday, *Romans*, pp. 2, 14, 67, 140, 141.

NOTE F. *Is Revelation progressive?* We are so accustomed in these days to talk glibly about 'development' and 'progress,' that we are apt to assume that what these terms should mean is true of everything connected with life. Actually the facts of history are very much against such a general conclusion. In a chapter entitled 'The Pauline contrasted with the Modern Method,' in *The Cities of St. Paul*, Sir W. M. Ramsay deals with the subject very fully, adducing many proofs to show that the common assumption is by no means justified. He points out that instead of a general record of progress, 'the history of religion among men is, with the rarest exceptions, a history of degeneration.' I would draw special attention to the following words: (1) 'Wherever you find a religion that grows purer and loftier, you find the prophet, the thinker, the teacher, who is in sympathy with the Divine, and he tells you that he is speaking the message of God, not his own message.' (2) 'Is it not the fact of human history that man, standing alone, degenerates; and that he progresses only where there

is in him so much sympathy with and devotion to the Divine life as to keep the social body pure and sweet and healthy?' (p. 17).

NOTE G. *Revelation and Inspiration.* 'Inspiration may be regarded in one aspect as the correlative of Revelation. Both operations imply a supernatural extension of the field of man's spiritual vision, but in different ways. By Inspiration we conceive that his natural powers are quickened so that he contemplates with a divine intuition the truth as it exists still among the ruins of the moral and physical worlds. By Revelation we see as it were the dark veil removed from the face of things, so that the true springs and issues of life stand disclosed in their eternal nature' (Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 8).

NOTE H. '*Therefore . . . they shall be (become) one flesh.*' I have no wish to push the implications of this narrative further than is justifiable, but the following thoughts may at least be *suggested*: The first words of Gen. ii. 24 are עַל־כֵּן (LXX, ἕνεκεν τούτου), that is an italicized '*therefore*': i.e. pointing back and forwards, back to a cause, forwards to why a certain result should follow. Man is the creation of God after the Divine archetype (Gen. i. 27), where it is distinctly said, 'in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them.' God is thus the Archetype of man, and of 'them.' From iii. 21 we learn that in the original man woman potentially exists. Therefore in the Archetype must exist that which corresponds to this potentiality of woman. Thus there exists in the Archetype the potentiality of both man and woman, and therefore that

which corresponds to the relationship between them. Hence in the growing union of man and woman there is a progress towards that which has also a Divine Archetype.

NOTE I. *On the Meaning of 'Flesh.'* 'Humanity from the side of its weakness and dependence . . . is naturally described as "flesh." In this respect "flesh" expresses . . . human nature as a whole regarded under the aspect of its present corporeal embodiment, including of necessity the "soul," and the "spirit" as belonging to the totality of man' (Westcott, *St. John*, i. 14).

NOTE J. *The City having the Foundations.* Bishop Westcott (*Hebrews*, p. 360) points out that the object of Abraham's desire 'was social and not personal only. "He looked for the city that hath the foundations"—the divine ideal' [which already exists in the Divine Mind], 'of which every earthly institution is but a transitory image.' If only law-makers and politicians (those who have to do with the city) could only realize that their one hope of promoting social welfare depended on their efforts to cause the actual to approximate to the divine ideal! Bishop Westcott also says: 'God Himself frames and constructs the heavenly city no less than the heavenly sanctuary.' A remembrance of this would prevent people regarding that which has to do with 'politics,' with the State, as 'secular,' while that which has to do with the Church as 'sacred.' In an additional note (pp. 386–387) Bishop Westcott writes: 'It is however under the idea of the "city," the State (πόλις), that Christian Society enters most fully upon the inheritance of earlier life. Three distinct elements

contribute to the fulness of the conception of the Christian πόλις, (*a*) the Jewish, (*b*) the Greek, (*c*) the Stoic. The great contribution of the Old Testament was the thought of the Divine Sovereignty with all its issues; possibly the chief contribution of the Greek was the responsibility of each citizen for the direct use of his power and privileges; the debt of Christianity to Stoicism (even where this worked indirectly through the later Judaism) has not yet been adequately acknowledged, for it was the Stoic teachers who proclaimed a universal πόλις—a city co-extensive with the world. This conception was adopted by Philo (*de Jos.* § 6; ii. 46, 47).' Bishop Westcott cites several cases in which the Stoics assert the reality of the idea of the archetypal πόλις, *e.g.* Epictetus (*Dissert.* ii. 5, 26), and especially Marcus Aurelius (*Medit.* ii. 16; cp. iv. 4).

NOTE K. *The 'Heart.'* In Hebrew psychology the 'heart' is the seat of intelligence, of intellect, as the 'soul' is the organ of the desires or affections. In Deut. iv. 9 the 'heart' seems to be specially the organ of intelligent memory (an important factor in the wise dealing of parents with children). Malachi iv. 6 is one of the many instances in which the Bible teaches us the important lesson of appealing to the highest in man, and so in children. From my experience as a parochial clergyman I should say that by far the most common cause of disagreement between parents and children lay in an inability—generally arising from a want of effort—in either to understand the thoughts (the mind) of the other. Those parents who 'keep their child-mind fresh to the end' are generally by far the most successful. Knowledge (and imagination) are essential for sympathy.

To-day the great improvement of education among the younger generation—especially where parents have been financially successful and so able to give their children a far superior education to their own—is a frequent cause (if an inevitable one) of parents and children 'thinking differently.' But this is no reason why the moral standards should differ, as unfortunately is frequently the case.

NOTE L. *Statutes and Judgments.* It is upon the permanent nature and obligation of both that stress is laid. 'The idea in חֹק is properly that of a *statute*, fixed by being *engraven* or inscribed on some durable surface; the idea of מִשְׁפָּט is that of a *judicial decision*, made authoritatively once, and constituting a rule, or precedent (even a custom), applicable to other similar cases in the future' (Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 62).

NOTE M. *Stoicism as a Preparation for Christianity.* Much has been written both for and against the debt which Christianity owes to Stoicism, for instance as to how far St. Paul himself was influenced by it; for Tarsus was a seat of the Stoic philosophy (*e.g.* The Essay on 'St. Paul and Seneca' in Lightfoot's *Philippians*). But there is, I venture to think, a more important and more useful subject of investigation, viz. the influence of Stoicism in the Graeco-Roman world as a *preparation* for Christianity; one in some ways, perhaps, parallel to the preparation by the Law among the Jews. It is in this way we shall best estimate the influence of Stoicism upon Christianity, especially in such spheres as psychology and ethics. The Stoic encouraged both self-introspection and self-discipline. Thus we may see the formation of an

atmosphere of thought and a conduct of life in both of which Christianity found elements not unlike certain belonging to itself. Hatch, in his *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 170, goes so far as to assert that 'The basis of Christian society is not Christian, but Roman and Stoical.' Of the strength and weakness of Stoicism in that Roman World into which Christianity came, much which is helpful will be found in Dill's *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, and in Glover's *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*. Two great weaknesses in Stoicism are well expressed by the latter: (1) 'The Stoics did not allow for the sense of Sin . . . the deeper realization of weakness and failure did not come to the Stoics; and what help their teaching of strenuous endeavour could have brought to men stricken with the consciousness of broken will-power it is hard to see' (pp. 67–68); (2) 'When they tell us to follow God, to obey God, to look to God, to live as God's sons, and leave us not altogether clear what they mean by God, their teaching is not very helpful, for it is hard to follow or look to a vaguely grasped conception' (p. 72).

NOTE N. *Industrialism and Slavery.* 'To one class of observers we appear to be threatened by social disaster, industrial chaos, a new slavery' (Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 8).

'To me, at least, it would be enough to condemn modern society as hardly an advance on slavery or serfdom, if the permanent condition of industry were to be that which we behold, that 90 per cent. of the actual producers of wealth have no home that they can call their own beyond the end of the week; have no bit of soil, or so much as a room that belongs to them; have

nothing of value of any kind except as much old furniture as will go in a cart; have the precarious chance of weekly wages which barely suffice to keep them in health. . . . This is the normal state of the average workman in town or country' (Frederick Harrison).

Miss Clementina Black writes of the most poorly paid class of workers: 'They are beyond the reach of organization. In their isolation and poverty they have no defence against the raids of the conscienceless sub-contractor, who is as literal a slave-driver as any who ever wielded a whip in the cotton fields, a slave-driver none the less because his whip is hunger instead of thongs' (*Sweated Industry*, p. xxiv).

NOTE O. *The Apathy of the Well-to-do Classes.* The quotation is from Professor G. A. Smith's *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. ii. pp. 53 ff. Professor Smith continues: 'The great causes of God and Humanity are not defeated by the hot assaults of the Devil, but by the slow, crushing, glacier-like mass of thousands and thousands of indifferent nobodies. God's causes are never destroyed by being blown up, but by being sat upon. It is not the violent and anarchical whom we have to fear in the war for human progress, but the slow, the staid, the respectable. And the danger of these does not lie in their stupidity. It lies in their real scepticism. . . . Respectability, however religious its mask, wherever it is mere comfort, decorousness, and conventionality; where, though it would abhor articulately confessing that God does nothing, it virtually means so—*says* so (as Zephaniah puts it) *in its heart*, by refusing to share manifest opportunities of serving Him, and covers its sloth and its fear by sneering that God is not with the

great crusades for freedom and purity to which it is summoned. In these ways Respectability is the precipitate which unbelief naturally forms in the selfish ease and stillness of so much of our middle-class life.'

NOTE P. *The Date of Isaiah lvi-lix.* Professor G. A. Smith writes: 'This is one of the sections which almost decisively place the literary unity of the "Second Isaiah" past possibility of belief' (*Isaiah*, vol. ii. p. 409). He is inclined for certain reasons, which he states, to place parts of these chapters in the pre-exilic age (the eighth century?), while parts of them he would assign to the period of the exile itself. Professor Skinner (*Isaiah*, vol. ii. p. 151) writes: 'The books of Malachi and Nehemiah reveal incidentally a state of affairs which would go far to account for the dark picture here presented of the ruling classes in the restored community.' Professor Cheyne (*Isaiah*, *Polychrome Bible*) insists upon the fragmentariness of the chapters, but assigns the main portion of the chapters to the age of Nehemiah. The whole question—which is far too large to be treated here—is carefully discussed by Professor Whitehouse in *Isaiah*, vol. ii. of *The Century Bible.*

NOTE Q. *The Old Testament Priesthood.* The commonly received idea, that the primary duty or original function of the Old Testament Priest was to offer propitiatory or other sacrifices at an altar can, in the light of recent research, no longer be maintained. Actually it seems that the conception of the priest as a sacrificing official is late rather than early. It may be that a function which originally was of occasional and secondary importance became, in process of time and

owing to influences which cannot be discussed here, the chief, though never the whole, part of the priest's office. The original meaning of כֹּהֵן is still disputed: it may mean a 'seer,' or one who 'stands,' *i.e.* ready to do the service of the deity. This, I think, now seems clear, that if we go back as early as we can, we find the 'priest' connected with a *sanctuary* rather than with an altar, and that his primary work is to give or declare an oracle rather than to offer a sacrifice; it is to declare the will of the deity rather than to propitiate him or obtain his favour. Here lies the origin of the teaching, judging, even ruling, functions of the priest. In this conception it will be seen there lie a number of potential issues, both higher and lower, both good and evil. Among the lower or evil tendencies is the temptation, through claiming superior knowledge of the divine will, to employ the deity as an instrument to serve the ends of the priesthood, even the temptation to lead the people to believe that the good will of the deity could be purchased by payments —generally regarded as offerings (indirect payments)— through the priesthood. What is foreign to Christianity is not the conception of the priesthood current in early Israel, but that current in connection with the Temple worship, and influenced by the assimilation of heathen notions of priesthood. The following authorities may with advantage be consulted: Art. 'Priests and Levites' in Hastings' *Bib. Dict.*, vol. iv.; Art. 'Priest' in *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. iii.; Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 358 ff.; Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 64 ff. The following sentences from this last may be quoted: 'To understand the position of the priests in old Israelite society, it has to be remembered that the performance of sacrificial rites was neither their

most important nor their most characteristic function. The power to sacrifice was not limited to a priest. . . . From the meagre evidence which we possess, and by the analogy of kindred phenomena in other religions, it would, therefore, seem that in the manipulation of the sacred lot lay the most potent function of the earlier priest. Whether as teacher, soothsayer, or judge, he was in each case the interpreter of Jehovah's will, the human mouthpiece of a supernatural revelation. . . . In his capacity of judge the priest maintained the Mosaic connection of morality with religion.'

From all this it will be seen that a number of interesting questions arise. Take this, for example. What was the connection between the offices of priest and prophet? That there was a connection seems clear from the number of priests who were also prophets. Would it be correct to say, that as the function of the priest became more and more that of the sacrificing official, the prophet took up, quite apart from any local or adventitious aid (that of sanctuary or sacred lot) and with greater directness of inspiration, the higher work of the priest, the revelation of the will of God?

NOTE R. *The Ceremonial and the Moral.* See an excellent chapter on 'The False Peace of Ritual,' by Professor G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. i. pp. 156 ff. In connection with the religion of Jehovah in the days of Amos, he shows that the distinguishing characteristic of heathenism is not so much idolatry as 'the stress it lays upon ceremonial.' By the side of the neglect or infringement of a religious rite, offences against one's fellow-men are regarded as mere misdemeanours. 'In the days of Amos this

pagan superstition thoroughly penetrated the religion of Jehovah, and so absorbed the attention of men that, without the indignant and complete repudiation of it, prophecy could not have started on her task of identifying morality with religion.' At the same time Professor Smith is prepared to admit that, 'There is an irreducible minimum of rite and routine in worship; there is an invaluable loyalty to traditional habits; there are holy and spiritual uses in symbol and sacrament' (p. 159).

One is at least tempted to ask whether the largely increased number of services which are the rule to-day, together with a very much greater interest in the correctness of ritual and ceremonialism, has been accompanied by a corresponding improvement either in the ethical teaching of the clergy or of their influence on behalf of righteousness. Mental energy—at all times a somewhat limited commodity—is apt to be diverted into channels which do not lead to the highest object.

NOTE S. *The Torah.* A clear understanding of the meaning of this word, generally translated 'law' in our English versions, is essential if we would understand the religion of the Old Testament. The root is ירה, probably 'to throw,' as the lot is thrown; hence תּוֹרָה (in the first instance — casting lots) means 'direction,' 'instruction,' and then 'law'; because originally the priest gave his direction according to the throw of the lot (see *Oxford Heb. Dict.* pp. 434 ff.). The torah is the sum total of the toroth, the directions or replies given by the priests. [There was also a Torah of the prophets.] Originally it was doubtless oral; it became traditional and also codified. See

Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 298 ff., where he shows how to the prophets the torah was 'the living prophetic word (Isa. i. 10). It was not yet a finished and complete system.' Here is one of the many great differences between the later priesthood and the prophets. Does not the same difference exist between certain Christian teachers to-day?

NOTE T. *The Instruction (Direction) of the Priesthood.* I feel so strongly that many of our social evils are due to moral causes, and that these again are due to the failure on the part of religious teachers generally to give clear ethical direction, to appeal to the highest in man—I feel so convinced that they have been engaged upon matters of comparatively small importance and so 'have neglected the weightier matters of the law (their *Torah*)—judgment, loyalty to righteousness (*i.e.* to God) and faithfulness,'—that I cannot refrain from quoting from Professor G. A. Smith's comment on these verses of 'Malachi' the following sentences: '"Malachi" . . . charges the priests . . . with the neglect of their intellectual duties to the people. . . . In all the range of prophecy there is not any [teaching] more in harmony with the prophetic ideal. How needed it is in our own age!—needed against those two extremes of religion from which we suffer, the limitation of the ideal of priesthood to the communication of a magic grace, and its evaporation in a vague religiosity from which the intellect is excluded as if it were perilous, worldly, and devilish. . . . There is a priesthood of knowledge, a priesthood of the intellect, says "Malachi," and he makes this a large part of God's covenant with Levi. Every priest of God is a priest of truth; and it is very largely by the Christian

ministry's neglect of their intellectual duties that so much irreligion prevails. As in "Malachi's" day, so now, "the laity take hurt and hindrance by our negligence." And, just as he points out, so with ourselves, the consequence is the growing indifference with which large bodies of the Christian ministry are regarded by the thoughtful portions both of our labouring and professional classes. Were the ministers of all the Churches to awake to their ideal in this matter, there would surely come a very great revival of religion among us' (*The Book of the Twelve*, vol. ii. pp. 361, 362).

NOTE U. *The Prophets as Social Reformers.* With the more thorough and enlightened study of the Old Testament prophets this aspect of the work of the prophets has received more and more attention. If we add to the title of this note the words 'from the religious standpoint,' we have, I believe, a description of the *chief* office and function of the prophets. Ahijah the Shilonite, Elijah and Elisha, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, and later Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and, in a still later age, 'Malachi' stand out prominently in this capacity. With the *rôle* of the reformer Isaiah and Jeremiah combined that of the constructive statesman. The divorce of religion and politics which to some extent we see in action to-day, and the warning against 'mixing religion and politics' which is so often given at the present time, would both have been incomprehensible to the Old Testament prophets. The highest welfare of the community was their first care. To them our division into 'sacred' and 'secular' was unknown. This is the primary, and a much needed, lesson which we must learn from them, though of course individual prophets approach the

problems of reform, and regard the duties of the highest patriotism, from somewhat different points of view; for instance, Amos and Hosea, or Isaiah and Jeremiah. Where that which is to-day termed political religion, or 'the mixing of religion and politics,' differs from the teaching of the prophets lies mainly here, that to-day when the Church enters the political arena it is too often *only* when what she is tempted to regard as her 'rights' or her 'interests' are being attacked. She then enters to protect or assert these. The prophets, on the other hand, not only entered, but dwelt in the midst of, political life as the champions of righteousness and justice, and especially of the poor and the oppressed. It is not necessary for me to add to what I have said upon the stress the prophets lay on the need of moralizing the social relationships, which is in fact their chief message. I will only draw attention to the immense importance they attach to the virtue or quality of *hésed* (חֶסֶד), a word which occurs at least twenty-six times in the prophets alone. Unfortunately this importance is lost to the English reader through the variety of words used in the English versions to translate this one Hebrew term, *e.g.* in the first three occurrences of the word in Hosea it is translated by 'loving-kindness' (ii. 19), by 'mercy' (iv. 1), and by 'goodness' (vi. 4). Is it not from a want of *hésed* that society in all its various relationships is chiefly suffering to-day? Is not a greater supply or expression of *hésed* the first requisite for the solution of our various social problems? The following extracts will help to elucidate the comprehensive signification of the word: 'It ought never to be forgotten that in Hebrew thought there is no contrast such as is drawn in certain schools of theology between

justice, equity, and kindness. Kindness and truth (fidelity) are the basis of society, and righteousness—even forensic righteousness—involves these, for it is the part of good government not to administer a hard-and-fast rule, but to insist on considerate and brotherly conduct. If we forget this we shall not do justice to the emphasis laid by the prophets on civil righteousness ' (Robertson Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, p. 407).

There is another and a most important truth which a study of the biblical use of this word *hésed* impresses upon us—one upon which, I may say, it is the chief purpose of these lectures to insist, namely, that the *hésed* which should exist between man and man, depends upon and is inspired by the *hésed* between God and man and between man and God; or rather—remembering the somewhat imperfect conceptions of individuality or personality of the Old Testament—between God and Israel and between Israel and God; or we might still further say that even here the *hésed* between God and the individual Israelite depends on the *hésed* between God and Israel as a nation. The unity and dependence of these various moral relationships is well explained by Professor Robertson Smith: ' Jehovah and Israel are united by a bond of moral obligation . . . a bond of piety—of fatherly affection on the one hand, and of loyal obedience on the other. Jehovah and Israel form as it were one community, and *hésed* is the bond by which the whole community is knit together. It is not necessary to distinguish Jehovah's *hésed* to Israel which we would term His grace, Israel's duty of *hésed* to Jehovah which we would call piety, and the relation of *hésed* between man and man which embraces the duties of love and mutual consideration. To the Hebrew mind these

three are essentially one, and all are comprised in the same covenant. Loyalty and kindness between man and man are not duties inferred from Israel's relation to Jehovah, they are parts of that relation; love to Jehovah and love to one's brethren in Jehovah's house are identical. To Hosea and Amos justice and the obligations of civil righteousness are . . . the chief sphere within which the right knowledge of Jehovah and due regard to His covenant are tested' (*Prophets of Israel*, pp. 161, 162).

NOTE V. *The Sovereignty of Jehovah over Israel.* The uniqueness of the constitution of Israel does not consist in the recognition of the supreme sovereignty of God, but in the *moral character* and *moral requirements* of Jehovah. This is clearly explained, as Professor Robertson Smith points out, in the part Elijah took in reference to the crime of Ahab in regard to Naboth. That crime 'was no ordinary act of violence, but an insult to the moral sense of all Israel. In condemning it Elijah pleaded the cause of Jehovah as the cause of civil order and righteousness . . . the sovereignty of Jehovah was not an empty thought; it was the refuge of the oppressed, the support of the weak against the mighty . . . if Jehovah claimed Israel as His dominion, . . . He did so because His rule was the rule of absolute righteousness' (*Prophets of Israel*, p. 87, and see the whole chapter upon 'Jehovah and the Gods of the Nations'). The work of the Church to-day—as the divinely ordained instrument for the establishment of the Kingdom of God—is the assertion of the sovereignty of God; hence its work is the same as Elijah's—the assertion of the claims of *righteousness* (of which justice

is a part), and therefore of the rights of the weak, the poor, and the oppressed.

NOTE W. *Freedom.* 'Jehovah represented to Israel two of the greatest blessings that any people can enjoy. . . . The first of these was *liberty* . . . the second was *law, justice,* and the *moral order* of society . . . the claim of Jehovah to the exclusive worship of Israel is based on the deliverance that made Israel a free people, and issues in the great laws of social morality. The cause of Jehovah in Israel was the cause of national freedom and social righteousness' (Robertson Smith, *Prophets of Israel,* pp. 40, 41).

'It is a fact of great interest, that in the prodigious controversy between the Divine Right of Kings and the Liberty of the People, the advocates of the former chiefly chose texts from the New Testament, while the champions of the people relied on the Old' (G. A. Smith, *The Preaching of the Old Testament,* p. 21).

NOTE X. *The Mitigation of War.* In Professor L. T. Hobhouse's *Morals in Evolution* there is a useful chapter on 'Relations between Communities' (vol. i. chap. vi.). In it he urges that 'morality is in its origin group-morality,' and that 'this implies a very narrow circumscription of the ethical area,' also that 'the essential features of group-morality are maintained with great persistence . . . into the higher civilizations.' He further states that 'a great part of the comparative study of ethics consists in tracing the forms assumed by group-morality and its modification by wider ideas of obligation.' Applications of all these statements in various spheres readily suggest themselves to us; and

many of these applications will be proofs of the imperfection of the Christianization of various social relationships. Professor Hobhouse then proceeds to trace historically, in savage nations, in very early civilizations (*e.g.* Egypt and Assyria) in the Old Testament, in Greece and Rome, finally in mediæval and modern Europe, the changes in the methods of the treatment of those conquered in war. In the course of his investigation he shows that in the very earliest times there is some evidence of customs and obligations in war, 'germs of moral feeling and fair play,' yet in savage warfare 'the rightlessness of the conquered' is practically almost always assumed. Then in very early civilization the growth of industry tends towards the enslavement of prisoners in place of their destruction. Plato condemns certain barbarities in war, and Aristotle enjoins respect for the conquered within the limits of Hellas. Roman jurists, again, condemn certain kinds of barbarous treatment of the vanquished. He then proceeds to show the bearing of universalism, as represented by the world religions, upon the moralities of war. He next describes how, 'while the Gospels pronounced definitely against violence in any shape or form, the Church accommodated her teaching to the practice of a warlike age, and Augustine upholds the soldier's profession, and endeavours to lay down the conditions upon which war is justified.' Passing over the Middle Ages, 'we come to the principle to which Grotius appealed, the law of Nature, which . . . expressed the profound ethical truth that the rights and duties of men . . . rest upon certain universal attributes of humanity.' One application of this is, that the enemy does not cease to be a man, the soldier of the beaten army is not in fault, 'he has merely done his

duty as a patriot'; 'to make him suffer for the delinquencies of his government' is 'to apply the barbaric principle of collective responsibility.' At the end of the chapter the principles of Mazzini and Comte are clearly explained, and it is shown how, 'Just as international law rests in its beginnings on the conception of humanity as incarnate in the person of every human being, so in the consummated conception of right and brotherhood between nations, it touches the other pole of modern ethics—the conception of humanity as a whole, the sum of all human beings and their collective history. In this conception the old group-morality disappears. The special relations of citizenship impose special obligations, but they are no longer incompatible with the wider obligations to humanity at large, but supplement them.' The gradual approximation in course of time to the principles of Christianity—surely in a large measure due to the permeation and diffusive influence of Christian teaching—cannot fail to be noticed. Much that is extremely interesting as well as very instructive upon this subject will also be found in Westermarck's *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, vol. i. chaps. xiv. and xv.

LECTURE III

LECTURE III

THE NEW TESTAMENT

I bow my knees unto the Father, from Whom every family in heaven and on earth is named (Eph. iii. 14, 15).

No longer do I call you servants; because the servant knoweth not what his lord is doing: but you I have called friends, because all things that I heard from my Father I made known unto you (St. John xv. 15).

Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and everyone that loveth hath been begotten of God, and knoweth God (1 John iv. 7).

In this lecture I propose to examine the teaching of the New Testament upon the same five important social relationships to which I have in the previous lectures more particularly called attention. Had space permitted I would have said at least something upon the valuable instruction we may gather in regard to them from the books commonly called apocryphal, and, among these, specially from Tobit and Ecclesiasticus.[1] I may also notice here that one among our many gains from the so-called 'Higher Criticism' of the Old Testament—from its assigning to certain books[2] a somewhat later date

[1] See Note A.

[2] *e.g.* many of the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes.

than the traditional one—is that it has helped us to understand much more clearly what were the ideas of the more deeply religious Jews upon this and other subjects during the centuries immediately preceding the Incarnation.[1] The truth *nihil per saltum* applies here as everywhere in history. The exquisite pictures of family ideals and family relationships in the first two chapters of St. Luke and the first chapter of St. Matthew were, we may well believe, not in any sense unique either in that or the immediately preceding age.[2]

I

I will again begin by considering the family relationships. It has been frequently pointed out[3] that upon no subject is Christ's teaching clearer or more insistent than upon these,[4] and especially upon the most fundamental of them—that of husband and

[1] The researches of such scholars as Prof. Charles into Jewish Apocryphal literature are enabling us to understand much more perfectly the religious ideas of the Jews in the first two centuries before Christ; without committing ourselves to its critical judgments, much may be learnt from Prof. Cheyne's *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*.

[2] Note B.

[3] See especially Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, chap. iii, 'The Teaching of Jesus concerning the Family.' In this chapter will be found many references to works of socialist and other writers upon the whole question of the family.

[4] Note C.

wife. For this peculiar definiteness and insistence there can be but one reason. He saw the infinite importance for the welfare both of the individual and of society that this, the first of all relationships, should be rightly regarded; for only then could it be adequately discharged. He saw that if this relationship was wrong, life and character were poisoned at their source; and to poison family life meant the poisoning of national life; indeed, of all life. Christ evidently saw quite clearly that the permanence, the inviolability, of the marriage tie was an absolutely essential condition for the right influence of parents upon their children, and of children upon their parents. He saw that the proper development of the characters, not only of the children, but of the parents themselves, depended upon this. God has implanted in man the instinct and desire for creation (or reproduction), and for possession; He has also given to man the faculty for nurture in the widest sense of the term. May we not regard the far longer period of helplessness and dependence in the human offspring as the other aspect of this same fact? Then, is it not natural, that not only a mother, but also a father, should love his or her child far more than the child of others? The prophetic Old Testament writer proved that he had discerned the true nature of wisdom—a power from a Divine source—when he chose the reference to the

maternal instinct to illustrate the immensity of the wisdom of Solomon.[1] Is not the first quality of wisdom an insight into the true nature of the forces of the universe? Is not its second quality obedience to these forces? Both the father's and the mother's natural relationship to the child (the responsibility of both for the child) continues long after birth. For, surely, the natural part of the father is to provide for both mother and child, and, as I have already noticed, the period of helplessness in the human infant is long. Thus, both the providence of the father and the care of the mother must be long continued.

During all this time, and indeed long after the period of the child's absolute helplessness is ended, the family is the Divinely appointed school in which the essentially Christian virtues, those most characteristic of Jesus Himself—love, tenderness, faithfulness, the sense of responsibility, patience, perseverance, and purity—should, in the parents, be in process of being strengthened and cultivated.[2] What school of character-formation, what discipline of the highest morality, can be more efficacious than this?

I will ask you again to pay special heed to these

[1] 1 Kings iii. 16 ff., notice especially vv. 26, 27. Aristotle, in condemning Plato's suggestion of community of wives and children, writes: δύο γάρ ἐστιν, ἃ μάλιστα ποιεῖ κήδεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ φιλεῖν, τό τε ἴδιον καὶ τὸ ἀγαπητόν (*Politic.* ii. c. 4).

[2] Note D.

words of Christ: 'He which made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh. So that they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.'[1] For the ordinary English reader the original Greek of the final words is most inadequately expressed, because he is generally ignorant of the close connection between the words 'join' and 'yoke.'[2] What our Lord implies is, that man and wife form a single entity, indivisible even in thought, which God hath put under one *yoke*, in order that together, by mutually helping each other, they may further the progress of the purpose of life.

To-day there is special need for the greatest stress being laid upon Christ's teaching on marriage and the family, because, as I have already indicated in the previous lectures, these institutions are being attacked by peculiarly insidious methods. For instance, in the name of a pseudo-social science which is very liable to mislead those who have not sufficient knowledge to question its assertions, we are told

[1] St. Matt. xix. 4 ff.

[2] See under the words in Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary*. The Greek is ὃ οὖν ὁ Θεὸς συνέζευξεν. Notice the singular ὃ. The object of the yoking together is that the burden may be drawn along by both.

that marriage and the family are 'but a stage in the process of human and social development, and that to the end of this stage we are now rapidly approaching.' We are informed that in the struggle for existence of various forms of society, that of the family cannot survive, because it is not the form most suited to meet the needs imposed by social progress.[1] This is, of course, an attempt to apply in its crudest form that doctrine of the cosmic process of which I have already spoken,[2] and to apply it in a sphere where true progress demands that this process shall as far as possible be opposed. If there is any one Christian principle more sure than another it is, as I have stated, that Christianity itself is an attempt to combat the cosmic process in the ethical sphere, in the higher rational and social life of man. All true ethical progress has been marked by the success of this opposition.

We must have every sympathy with the *aims* of the socialist so far as these are directed towards enabling those great masses of the poor to live a truly human life, who, from sheer force of circumstances, are to-day precluded from doing this.[3] But at the same time we must warn those socialists who would belittle the importance and the sanctity of

[1] Note E.

[2] See pp. 30 ff., 60 ff.

[3] For proofs of this see Additional Note, pp. 73 ff.

the family,[1] that this aim—of raising the poor—can never be accomplished by denying the facts of experience, and by ignoring the natural, Divinely given instincts of human nature; and the depreciation or supersession of marriage and the family certainly means the denial of these. On the other hand, we must clearly proclaim to them that, if their aim is, as they state it to be, the improvement of man, then the only hope of accomplishing this aim, and the only method by which they can achieve success, is by setting as high a value upon both marriage and the family as Christ Himself set upon them. Instead of its promoting the lofty professed aims of socialism, any weakening of the family idea or family responsibilities would be to give the rein to an utterly irresponsible and unrestricted individualism; it would be nothing less than to admit the self-assertion of pure selfishness. The root of all this evil teaching lies, I believe, in a materialistic, and so a hopelessly inadequate, philosophy of man, one which, we may thank God, is now disclaimed by practically every thinker of reputation.[2] And it is

[1] The socialists who would destroy the family actually arrogate to themselves, I believe, the name 'scientific socialists.' But their want of scientific thinking is shown by the way in which they ignore the deepest and loftiest feelings—some of the most important factors—of human nature.

[2] It must be remembered that in their (generally unconscious) philosophy of life the uneducated and the thoughtless are from a quarter to half a century behind those who read and think. Truth

disclaimed because it is now seen that its theory of man will not explain the facts of human nature or of human experience. Man cannot live by bread alone; whenever he has attempted to do so, he has invariably failed. If the socialist claims that the end and purpose of his method is the improvement of man, then he must appeal to, and he must develop, not what is lowest but what is highest in human nature, that is, he must appeal to man's ethical nature and ethical capacities. For the development of these the life and the discipline of the family are of all schools infinitely the most efficient.

Let me stay for a moment to give a particular present application to what I have just stated. Let me again remind you that recently there has been made public overwhelming evidence which shows, that not only our Poor Law system, but still more the administration of that system, require the most drastic reformation. Upon the nature, and especially upon the details, of the legislation needed for this reformation there is, as you know, a wide diversity of opinion. Upon one point, however, I trust we may be united, namely, in demanding that the family as an institution, and, together with this,

filters only slowly downwards. Much of the scientific literature read by the working class consists of cheap reprints of books whose copyright has expired.

family feeling, family ties, and family responsibilities, shall not be weakened, but that, on the contrary, everything possible shall be done to strengthen them. 'Will it tend to strengthen the family?' is a test to which it must be possible to give an affirmative answer before any proposal can be accepted.[1] But while I insist upon this, let me once again remind you that to-day there is much in our industrial system and industrial arrangements which has made, and is still making, a true family life not merely difficult, but actually impossible.[2] To demand from people what they cannot supply is not merely foolish, it is the way to tempt them to despair. To demand a true family life without a home in which to live it, or without the possibility of obtaining even the necessaries of life for its support, is to prove our own hypocrisy. One of the chief objects of the Christian social reformer must be so to alter present conditions that in every rank of society a genuine family life, the best school of the highest and noblest characters, shall be universally possible.

To appreciate our Lord's teaching upon the

[1] The section on 'The Integrity of the Family' (chap. xii. G. i.) in the Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission should be carefully studied. See Note F.

[2] See Additional Note to Lecture I, pp. 73 ff. The conviction of this impossibility—the many examples of it patent to all who live and work among the poor—is, I believe, the most fertile of all the sources of socialistic agitation at the present time.

family we must remember, as Harnack has so clearly pointed out,[1] that the chief subjects of His teaching are 'first, the Kingdom of God and its coming; secondly, God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul; and thirdly, the higher righteousness and the commandment of love.' The first may be regarded as His object; the second as His governing principles; the third as the means and methods whereby, according to these principles, His object may be achieved. Now chief among these means, and most efficacious among these methods, at once the most useful and universal, is the discipline of both parenthood and childhood. The immediate *purpose* or object of such a discipline is revealed by the conviction of the value of the human soul; the immediate *result* is the conviction of the value of the highest parenthood. The final purpose of all is nothing less than the realization of the perfect society through the practical recognition of God's sovereignty in the heart—the establishment of the Kingdom of God.

Here are two views of the family: First, that its existence, its preservation, its purification, and its exaltation are the best, are indeed essential conditions for the welfare of society and for the highest development of the individual. This view is frankly utilitarian. I have no quarrel with it,

[1] Eng. Trans. *What is Christianity?* p. 51.

and certainly for its truth long and wide experience may be cited, only I think it is wholly insufficient. The second view is different, though not necessarily contradictory. The idea of the family is Divine; its archetype lies in the Godhead Itself; the family relationships, ideally, are those which exist between the Persons of the Divine Trinity. We shall never realize what true parenthood is, what parental and filial affection, what the right relationship of parent to child and child to parent should imply, we shall never understand what family life and family unity should mean, until we realize that God is love, and also the full significance of such sayings as these: 'O righteous Father . . . I knew Thee';[1] 'the love wherewith Thou lovedst me';[2] 'I and the Father are one';[3] 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father';[4] 'He taketh of Mine';[5] the 'unity' and the 'fellowship' of the Holy Spirit.

The issues of our Lord's teaching upon the family are clearly seen when we study the writings of His followers. What is the origin of St. Paul's saying, 'I bow my knees unto the Father'[6]—'the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory'[7]—'out of Whom,'[8] as the Origin and Archetype of all parenthood, 'every family[9] in heaven

[1] St. John xvii. 25.
[2] St. John xvii. 26.
[3] St. John x. 30.
[4] St. John xiv. 9.
[5] St. John xvi. 15.
[6] Eph. iii. 14.
[7] Eph. i. 17.
[8] ἐξ οὗ.
[9] πᾶσα πατριὰ.

and earth is named'? As the 'name' reveals the nature and character, so here, not only the source, but the true nature and character of every family are revealed;[1] and the family is the unit of every greater *patria* or society. 'The God of our Lord Jesus Christ' is the God of righteousness, of justice, love, self-sacrifice, mercy, purity, and truth. These virtues, inherent in God, must be realized in the life of every *patria*, of which the family is both the simplest and the commonest form.[2] As 'the God of our Lord Jesus Christ' is unthinkable apart from these virtues, so is the true, the ideal family life. Only upon these virtues can the true family life be built, only when it cultivates, produces, develops these is its highest purpose being fulfilled.

Next we must notice St. Paul's teaching upon the relationships which must exist between the *parts* of the family. The relationship between husband and wife must be capable of expression in terms drawn from the nature, position, and work of Christ.[3] The moral qualities of the character of Christ must be reproduced in each, and must govern the mutual relationship of each to the other. Love, issuing in self-sacrifice, is the chief of these:[4]

[1] ὀνομάζεται: 'derives that which truly makes it what it is' (Bishop Westcott).

[2] Note G.

[3] Eph. v. 22 ff.

[4] Eph. v. 25.

constant, tender affection on the part of the husband,[1] and reverence [2] (which assumes the existence of that which commands reverence) on the part of the wife.[3] As with the marital, so must it be with the parental and filial relationships.[4] Parents are so to rule as not to provoke or irritate [5] their children. Conscience and the capacity for appreciating justice and consideration—two high moral qualities —are assumed in the children.[6] These must also be encouraged; and encouragement is the special office of the Holy Spirit: [7] the children must not be caused to lose heart. Then they must be educated,[8] *i.e.* their expanding natures must be developed, not on principles or methods self-chosen or self-invented by the parents, that is not wilfully, but on such principles and methods as answer to 'the mind of the Lord.'

We now turn to the children. They are to obey their parents 'in the Lord.' The position, and so the authority, of the parents towards the child are of

[1] Eph. v. 29. [2] Eph. v. 33.

[3] The true translation of ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα in verse 28, 'as being their own bodies,' emphasizes St. Paul's idea of the unity of husband and wife.

[4] Eph. vi. 1 ff.

[5] In Eph. vi. 4 we have παροργίζετε, in Col. iii. 21, ἐρεθίζετε.

[6] Also the religious sense is present in embryo; as Bishop Westcott says, 'The child can recognize his spiritual relation to Christ in its earliest years, before doctrine is grasped intellectually.'

[7] The true meaning of both παράκλητος and 'Comforter.'

[8] ἐκτρέφετε is by the Vulgate rendered *educate*.

Divine sanction.[1] This should be the highest of all inspirations to the parents, and should cause them to feel the infinite responsibility of their position. At first the father represents God to the child: here is one of the sources of the priesthood of the headship of the family.[2] As God is the source of all the moral virtues, these same virtues must be cultivated in the father's nature and expressed in his conduct, which must, therefore, be characterized by love and tenderness, also by justice, and (if need be) by punishment of evil. His rule and his authority should be a reflection of the Divine rule. Only where this is so can we hope for an adequate obedience to the fifth commandment;[3] only then can children certainly obey their parents entirely 'in the Lord.'

Forgive me for dwelling at such length upon this relationship. I do so because I feel the necessity is laid upon me, indeed forced upon me, from a long and wide experience as a parochial clergyman. We have at work in many of our parishes a 'Mothers' Union,' a society which, by teaching and encouraging mothers to be mothers indeed, is in thousands of homes doing a noble and truly useful work. We want an equally strong society to teach fathers to discharge the duties and responsibilities

[1] Note *δίκαιον* in Eph. vi. 1.

[2] Inevitably, at first, the parent stands *between* the child and God: the parent's office is to lead the child to God.

[3] Which may have been inscribed on the first table.

of fatherhood.[1] We want it in the homes of the richest and in the homes of the poorest: only in these latter homes we must see that the possibilities of discharging the duties of fatherhood exist. I venture to prophesy to any here who contemplate taking Holy Orders, that if things continue as they are, they will have no more painful duty to perform than that of teaching the fifth commandment to some of their confirmation candidates. The national life is made in the home. There order and obedience, there respect for authority, there the moral virtues—the true foundations of civic life—are first and most perfectly learnt. But in thousands of well-to-do homes in England to-day fathers are either shirking their responsibilities, or they are delegating them entirely to various professional parents;[2] while in tens of thousands of poor homes the father, often in the first instance by no fault of his own, is actually debarred by what are termed 'circumstances' from providing for even the physical needs of his children. Time goes on, unemployment, long enforced idleness, has produced deterioration of character. He becomes an idle

[1] Could not such a society issue from the Church of England Men's Society, a society which in various ways is doing such an excellent work among men? True churchmanship—the realization of what membership in Christ implies—means in a father all that is here demanded.

[2] See Note C (3) to Lecture I. p. 53 f.

loafer, possibly a wastrel, dependent on the earnings, if not of his wife, of his boys and girls.[1] The clergy are called upon to teach these boys and girls to 'honour' their father, *that* father! Only in judging him I beg you to remember that in many cases, though by no means in all, that father has become what he is, largely owing to a system for which each one of us is to some degree responsible. Can we wonder that an earnest Christian reformer has written of 'The Stake of the Church in the Social Movement'?[2]

II

What has the New Testament to say upon the relationship between the employer and the employed, between buyer and seller, and especially between those who buy and sell the commodity of labour, which we have seen to be the expenditure of life?[3] We will, again, turn first to the teaching of Jesus Himself. In Him we find a striking proof of the truth which asserts that the personal example is the most eloquent of all lessons. That example has been comprehensively described by St. Paul in three

[1] A Sunday-school teacher recently threatened to report a refractory youth of fifteen to his father. The lad's retort was, 'e'd better take care 'ow 'e meddles with me, I 'elps to keep 'im.'

[2] Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, chap. vi.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 19 ff.

words—*μορφὴν δούλου λαβών*,[1] 'He assumed the characteristic, the essential attributes of a servant.' The Saviour of the world, in subjection[2] to one who stood to Him in the place of an earthly father, 'began life' by working in a carpenter's shop at Nazareth. From then to the hour of His death upon the Cross the life of Jesus was essentially one of labour. He found the satisfaction of His nature[3] —think of those compulsorily unemployed!—in accomplishing His Father's work. In working unceasingly He was at one with the Father, for 'My Father worketh until now, and I work.'[4] The duration of His life here under the conditions of humanity, Jesus recognized, was strictly limited; so He declares, 'We must work the works of Him that sent Me.'[5] His last prayer of self-consecration is uttered in the conviction that the work on earth (under His historic manifestation) with which the Father had commissioned Him was accomplished.[6] From these various sayings three truths stand out

[1] Phil. ii. 7.

[2] St. Luke ii. 51. *ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος*: 'This sums up the condition of the Messiah during the next seventeen years. The analytical tense gives prominence to the continuance of the subjection' (Plummer *in loc*).

[3] St. John iv. 34.

[4] St. John v. 17.

[5] St. John ix. 4. According to the more probable reading, our Lord associates His disciples with Himself.

[6] St. John xvii. 4. As Bishop Westcott points out, 'the participle *τελειώσας* simply defines the mode' (by the best and highest work) 'in which the glory of God was secured.'

with special prominence: first, the divinity of work, as part of the life of God; secondly, that the relationship between employer and employed (as co-operators towards the same object) has its archetype in the relationship between the Persons of the Godhead, and not only in the relationship between the Father and the Son, but in that between the Son and the Spirit;[1] thirdly, that this relationship between employer and employed is ideally one of *intelligent* co-operation, which is the relationship between Christ and His true disciples, and which must be that between His true disciples themselves.[2] 'Ye are my friends if ye do the things which I command you': 'No longer do I call you servants, for the servant knoweth not what his lord is doing.'[3]

When we pass from the example to the *teaching* of Christ, for instance in His parables,[4] we cannot fail to notice how large a proportion of this teaching has reference to various aspects of ordinary, every-day work. The teaching was mainly addressed to working people. It assumes work to be the natural lot of man.[5] It teaches us how to work, and how to regard work. It shows us what different kinds of

[1] St. John xvi. 13, 14; cp. vv. 7 ff., also xv. 26, &c.

[2] St. John xvii. 18 ff.

[3] St. John xv. 15. Note H.

[4] The Labourers in the Vineyard; The Wicked Husbandmen; The Talents; The Pounds; The Two Sons; The Sower; The Leaven; The Draw Net; &c.

[5] St. Matt. xx. 6; St. Mark xiii. 34; cp. Gen. iii. 17, 18.

work there are, and that these various kinds of work demand co-operation between those who do them.[1] Christ's teaching constantly implies workers of different sorts and grades: it assumes not only the existence of employer and employed, but the necessity for both; it assumes the need of buyer and seller, of the headworker[2] and the handworker. But beneath all our Lord's teaching on this subject there runs one great underlying principle—that of stewardship, in its most comprehensive sense, and stewardship is only another term for responsibility.[3] And we must remember that the steward, however important his position, or however far-reaching his responsibility, was himself a servant, whether over a household or over some great *latifundium*; he has been placed there by the owner; and he has a double responsibility, first, to his final employer (who must represent God), and then to those whose services he employs. And he must possess and exercise the great moral virtues of faithfulness[4] (a most comprehensive virtue) and of prudence, and this latter, one of the special virtues needed for the mind-worker, is assumed in faithfulness. What is specially demanded of the steward is that he shall

[1] St. Luke xii. 42 ff.

[2] *φρόνιμος* in St. Luke xii. 42.

[3] *πιστὸς* in the same verse: for the want of this, see St. Luke xvi. 1.

[4] *πίστις*, in the sense of the Heb. אֱמֶת

give to those he employs their due wage at the right time.[1] The steward's particular temptation, which arises from forgetting that those whom he employs are his master's living possessions, is to oppress:[2] it is to try to live in luxury at the expense of those for whose welfare he is responsible.[3] How very modern the teaching of Christ is! What a warning we have here against the danger of wrong relationships between employer and employed arising from the want of those moral virtues[4] which are characteristic of Christ! Read this description of Christ given to us by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'Who was faithful . . . in all His house . . . whose house are we.'[5] We then see clearly how comprehensive and how Christian is this virtue of faithfulness.

Then the steward, who represents the employer, must also be wise or shrewd, that is he must be skilful in the adjustment of means to ends.[6] There was a world of evil in slavery; but, speaking generally, there was one advantage in the system

[1] *ἐν καιρῷ* [*τὸ*] *σιτομέτριον*, St. Luke xii. 42.

[2] St. Luke xii. 45.

[3] St. Luke xii. 45.

[4] Where undertakings on the co-operative principle have failed, it has generally been through the want of faithfulness in those who should have worked for the common good.

[5] Heb. iii. 3 and 6. Note I.

[6] This may be regarded as the intellectual counterpart of faithfulness, *i.e.* the best use of *brains*, as well as of hands, in the service of the employer.

which our modern industrial system (which presents so many analogies to slavery) does not seem to possess. In the slavery of the old world it was certainly to the advantage of the owner that his human property should be well treated, if for no other reason than that the fullest use or return might be obtained from it. This, to some extent, secured at least a measure of fair treatment for the slave. To see to this fair treatment was part of the steward's responsibility. By it, at least in part, his faithfulness to his master might be tested. But what is too often actually happening to-day? A man or woman or child is employed: little or no heed is paid by their employer to the conditions under which they may be compelled to live, sometimes, I fear, to those under which they work.[1] They themselves may not be bought as were slaves in the old world; but their health and strength and capabilities are bought. Owing to what are termed the 'exigencies of trade,' immense strain is put upon their physical powers. These, in consequence, are apt to wear out rapidly. 'Too old at forty' is a common experience to-day. The well or reserve of 'surplus labour' at the factory gate is never empty. The 'worn-out' man is all too easily

[1] For the Housing Question, see Additional Note to Lecture I. pp. 80 ff. The inspection of factories and workshops is even now notoriously insufficient, the inspectors being far too few in number.

replaced by another, who, in turn, is useful just so long as his strength lasts and no longer; when it fails he, too, like the one into whose place he stepped, must be thrown upon the scrap-heap of worn-out and broken human machinery. What is the moral factor in such a relationship between the employer and the employed? What moral conditions enter into the connection or relationship between them? And what becomes of the discarded worn-out man? He is just another addition to the constantly accumulating heap of the unemployed, who all too rapidly become unemployable. He becomes a burden to the community, which at heart resents his very existence; for it resents the constantly increasing cost of maintaining the continually increasing number of such as he is.[1] But unfortunately in many cases it is the community itself, through demanding and obtaining goods at less than a fair price[2]—by means of various 'parasitic' forms of industry—which is ultimately responsible for the position of the unemployed workman. Even the

[1] The real difficulty connected with the 'Unemployed Question' is not the number of unemployed at the present time, it is the different ways in which they are being manufactured by constantly accelerating processes.

[2] A proof of the prevailing rage for cheapness is found in the enormous crowds of women (of various classes) who flock to the season sales of the great retail establishments, their object being to try to get what they want for (as they confess) 'less than it is worth'!

demand for cheapness has its *nemesis*. Has not then, I ask again, the unemployed workman, at least when he is thrown out through no fault of his own, some claim upon the community? For we must remember that in many cases the direct cause of his unemployment is that the community may be supplied with what it needs at the lowest possible price.

But if Christ's teaching is both definite and exacting with regard to the responsibilities of the employer, it is not less so in reference to the duties of the workman. Take the parable of the Talents[1] and consider the man entrusted with *one* talent.[2] Nowhere in the Gospels is Christ's wonderful insight into human nature, into its weaknesses and temptations, more clearly shown than in His picture of the 'one-talent man.' That the five-talent man should rise above temptation, while the one-talent man should succumb to it, seems so out of harmony with the rest of Christ's teaching upon the comparative temptations of the rich and the poor. But experience proves that Christ was right. What Christ requires is that the man with small means and limited opportunities and in a humble capacity shall make the best use of all these, shall employ to the full such an endowment as he has. He, as much as the five-talent man, has a responsibility

[1] St. Matt. xxv. 14 ff.

[2] See a striking sermon by Phillips Brooks, series i. p. 138.

to discharge;[1] only it is far more difficult for him to realize this; hence his temptation to neglect it is so much the greater. The punishment meted out to him in the parable may seem severe, but experience shows us that it is exactly that which to-day is constantly meted out to the inefficient, the slacker, and the idler. From them, 'by force of circumstances,' is taken the little that they have. Outside the ranks of organized society they pass a miserable existence. If the man in a humble position is not faithful in that which is least, if he is not careful to give the worth of his wages in useful labour, he loses not merely these, but deterioration of character,[2] the loss of the true riches, supervenes. Once more, in this relationship between the employed and the employer there is a want of the moral factor, of that comprehensive moral quality of Christ's character termed faithfulness. From this wrong relationship, the result of the want of this all-important moral quality, not only does the workman himself suffer, ultimately society suffers and social welfare is diminished.[3]

[1] He has so little incentive in any hope of reward. See Note H.

[2] How far the increasingly mechanical nature of their occupations is affecting adversely the characters of the lower grades of workers is an important question.

[3] It must always be remembered that no class of society can have a wrong relationship to another class but to its own moral loss. Examples of this are frequently seen in those who have the supervision or command of races in a lower scale of civilization.

Upon the treatment of this relationship in the rest of the New Testament two passages from the Epistles must suffice. The first is from the Epistle of St. James,[1] and there is no passage in which the denunciation of oppression is more severe. The just wages of the labourer must not be withheld; his cry is heard in heaven. Injustice is not a sin only against man, but against God; it is the sin which slew the Lord Jesus Christ. A punishment upon it will certainly come from God. It is not an unjustifiable application of this teaching to see in it a denunciation of the sweated wage, which actually is a wage partly paid and partly withheld; for that which would make it a just wage is not paid. The relation of the sweater to his victims is distinctly immoral; it lacks the elementary virtues of justice, honesty, and mercy. The sweater is terribly to blame, and it is the duty of the community to make his action impossible. But is he the only one to be blamed? What of the people who run hither and thither in the prevailing rage for cheapness? what of those, especially women, who, in order to be in the fashion, seek to obtain the cheapest possible imitations of things

[1] St. James v. 4 ff. Mayor points out (i) the proverb ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ; and (ii) that 'the withholding of wages is one of the four sins which in the Bible are said to cry to heaven'; (iii) ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in contrast to the judgment in *heaven* of the Lord of Sabaoth. On the whole passage cp. Ecclus. xxxiv. 21, 22.

for which they cannot afford to pay? what of those who never attempt to reckon 'in terms of life'[1] the cost of what they purchase? These people, even by the deterioration of character produced by the constant desire for shams, and their contentment with these shams, wrong both themselves and others. The evil, unmoralized, social relationships, in which sweater and sweated alike are factors, are again both the cause and the concomitant of social unhealth.

The other passage, also a most important one, is from the Ephesian Epistle.[2] In it St. Paul deals briefly, yet comprehensively, with the duties and the responsibilities of both employer and employed; and here, as in his treatment of the family relationships, he lifts the subject on to the highest plane. 'Servants,' he writes, 'be obedient unto them that, according to the flesh, are your masters, with fear and trembling.' The phrase 'according to the flesh' implies the existence of another relationship,[3] and the phrases 'as unto Christ,' 'as servants of Christ,' 'doing the will of God,' and 'as to the Lord,' as well as the reference to 'their master and

[1] See p. 19 f. [2] Eph. vi. 5–9.

[3] On verse 5 Bishop Westcott remarks: 'Earthly relations are not neutralized by heavenly.' At the same time κατὰ σάρκα suggests the limit of the authority of earthly masters. [Social relationships in certain cases in the past might have been, and in the present might be, improved if this limit were remembered.]

yours in heaven,' all remind us once more of a Divine archetype of co-operative service.

'With fear and trembling' (the outward sign of fear) may seem a strong expression, but the faithful servant will fear lest any work be left undone:[1] he will also do his work without hypocrisy and without a single selfish thought. Then the words 'not with eye-service as men pleasers' also remind us that there must be no mere surface-work, no veneer of the outwardly satisfactory covering the unsatisfactory beneath—an experience of which we hear much in the work of to-day. God sees *through* untruthful work. A deep truth, one of universal application to both employer and employed, is asserted in the words, 'Knowing that every man, if he has done any good thing, shall receive what he has done.' To do some kind of work, voluntarily or of necessity, should be regarded as the appointed lot of all; and the effect of work upon character (as well as that of character upon work), the effect of the way and the spirit in which work is done, must be remembered. The relation of the workman to his work is a moral one, for it is the expression of his relation, not only to his master, but ultimately to God. And in Christian work the means and method and spirit are not less important than the

[1] 'With that zeal which is ever keenly apprehensive of not doing enough' (Meyer *in loc*).

end. In short, the whole teaching of the New Testament asserts that the relationship between employer and employed must primarily and essentially be a moral one; and the nature of this moral element must have an influence as wide as society itself.[1]

III

As in the two previous lectures, I turn next to consider the relationship between the religious teacher and the people. Whether explicitly or implicitly no subject occupies a larger space in the New Testament than this, which is certainly a proof of the importance attributed to it both by our Lord and by His Apostles in the establishment of the Kingdom of God. Our chief subject of study here, as in that of the two previous relationships I have already dwelt upon in this lecture, must be our Lord's own conduct and teaching. We must notice carefully His relationship towards those He would influence and teach, His whole conduct in regard to them; and we must compare this with that of the other religious teachers of His time, and especially with that of the Scribe and Pharisee. To begin with, Christ is never guilty of contempt for any human being.[2] How

[1] Note J. [2] Cp. Prov. xi. 12 (*a*).

different His attitude from that of those whose opinion of 'the people of the land' is expressed in the saying, 'This multitude which knoweth not the law are cursed'![1] Christ stands always between God and man, He is always equally conscious of both, and His relationship to man is perfect because His relationship to God is perfect.[2] He is 'the connection between the boundless supplies of Heaven and the equally boundless needs of men';[3] and He recognizes that the greatest of all those needs is righteousness, and that it is just this which Heaven does supply. He, an entirely righteous Personality, is constantly engaged in conveying righteousness to men. It is only righteousness for which He cares; we never find Him attempting to supply substitutes[4] for this—the greatest temptation of the religious official now, as always. Then, though the Scribe and Pharisee *spoke* much of 'righteousness,' it is clear that they had a wrong conception of both its nature and its content. It was a Pharisee himself who testified that the righteousness he had sought,

[1] St. John vii. 49. Westcott, *in loc.*, quotes 'Aboth' ii. 6: 'No brutish man is sinfearing, nor is one of the people of the earth pious.'

[2] This is why 'the inner life' of the pastor is so important.

[3] C. H. Spurgeon.

[4] *e.g.* Ceremonialism, and, to some extent, multiplied services, elaborate organization, and a purely 'social' Gospel.

and of which he had boasted, was not divine;[1] and because it was not divine it tended to become, as in his own case, actually inhuman.[2] The Pharisees thought more of things than of men. They not only tithed mint, anise, and cummin;[3] they devoured widows' houses.[4] They built the sepulchres of the prophets, whose teaching they disobeyed and whom they persecuted.[5] They forgot the weightier matters of the Divine law—judgment, mercy, and faithfulness[6]—the great moral virtues. Among the changes which have taken place during the last few years, for which we may be thankful, I should place the growing effort to moralize Christian teaching, and to make its intrinsic humaneness more clear.[7] The Incarnation has been put into its right relationship to the Atonement,[8] and the moral significance of the Atonement, as against a merely mechanical or even juridical interpretation of this, has been asserted. The Incarnation of Christ is the incarnation of the Infinite Righteousness, and the Atonement is its inevitable corollary. The Christian Ministry is a

[1] St. Paul; Phil. iii. 6, cp. verse 9; Rom. x. 3; cp. Isa. lxiv. 6.
[2] As a persecutor.
[3] St. Matt. xxiii. 23.
[4] St. Mark xii. 40.
[5] St. Luke xi. 47.
[6] St. Matt. xxiii. 23.
[7] Commenced by such writers as F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, Sir John Seeley, &c.
[8] By teachers like Bishops Westcott, Gore, and Talbot, and the writers in *Lux Mundi*, &c. See Note K.

ministry of reconciliation,[1] and this is effected by bringing to the sinner the virtues of Christ,[2] not by means of any mechanical apparatus, whether of words or signs or ceremonies, but by the only possible channel—a moral one—for the transmission of these moral virtues, that is, by the appeal to the conscience,[3] and by the effort to strengthen the will towards good. This was Christ's method, and what was accomplished in the moral regeneration of society in the early centuries was accomplished by men who put it into operation.[4] If society is to be really Christianized to-day, the same method must be followed and the same means must be applied.

St. Paul was a great ethical teacher,[5] a great preacher of righteousness; but his ethics were strictly theological: he attributed the ethical power (the moral dynamic) and the ethical qualities alike to God in and through Christ;[6] in the Gospel there was revealed a righteousness, but it was a

[1] 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

[2] Which are available to us through His sacrifice of Himself.

[3] 2 Cor. iv. 2.

[4] On the moral changes wrought by Christianity in the first centuries, see Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, Eng. Trans., pp. 363 ff.

[5] Upon St. Paul as 'The Ethical Teacher,' see lectures iii. and iv. of Prof. Lock's *St. Paul the Master Builder*.

[6] 'The centre of morality has been shifted; it has become the direct relation to a Person' (*ibid.* p. 96).

righteousness of God.[1] St. Paul's appeal was an appeal to the conscience—one moral faculty; and it must be made through the conduct,[2] the expression of the will—the other moral faculty. The commendation of himself and his fellow-ministers to their hearers was by means of the embodiment in conduct of the moral virtues—in pureness, in long-suffering, in kindness, in the word of truth, in the power of God, by the armour (offensive and defensive) of righteousness.[3] Throughout his epistles the moral demand is everywhere prominent. For instance, a large part of the First Epistle to the Corinthians is just a plea for the exercise of the elementary moral, which are the elementary social, virtues.[4] In the Second Epistle—his apologia *pro vitâ suâ*—his appeal is to his own personal conduct, to the moral virtues expressed in it.[5] Even supposing the Pastoral Epistles are not St. Paul's (an extremely rash assumption to make to-day),[6] they must embody the pastoral or ministerial ideals of a very early period of the Church's history. Suppose we were to remove from these their ethical teaching, their rules and exhortations in regard to moral conduct, what would be left? The Epistle of St. James and the First Epistles of St. Peter and St. John are really exhortations from pastors to their flocks, and

[1] Rom. i. 17. [2] 2 Cor. vi. 3 ff. [3] 2 Cor. vi. 7.
[4] *e.g.* 1 Cor. v. 1 ff.; vi. 9 ff. [5] 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff.
[6] See my *Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul*, p. viii.

reveal the relationship between them. What is each of these epistles but an ethical appeal and an ethical exhortation based on certain convictions concerning the ethical nature and will of God, and upon the Divine, and therefore ethical, nature, and upon the ethical work—the infinite self-sacrifice—of the Lord Jesus Christ?[1] And we must remember that all these early Christian letters were written during the *formative* period of the Christian society, at a time when there must have been every temptation to dwell upon the details of organization, upon the particular forms into which each writer might have thought it best for the society to crystallize itself. But how little there is upon this! What these great Christian pastors are thinking about is not forms of ecclesiastical government, not even forms of worship, but that God is the source of all righteousness, that His will is righteousness, that the Lord Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, of like nature to Himself, has made known and has made possible the one way of righteousness, and that to walk in this way is the one thing needful for the salvation (in the true sense of the word) of the individual and of society.[2] What above all else the clergy need to

[1] *e.g.* St. James iv. 4, 6, 8, &c.; 1 Pet. ii. 12, 20; iii. 4, &c.; 1 John i. 6; iii. 1; iv. 4; v. 4, &c.

[2] On *σωτηρία*: see Sanday and Headlam's *Romans*, p. 23: 'The fundamental idea contained in *σωτηρία* is the removal of dangers menacing to life and the consequent placing of life in conditions favourable to free and healthy expansion.'

realize to-day is that they are called to be the moral expression, the moral channels, and moral instruments of the highest moral truth and power, that is of Christian truth and of the power of a Christlike life.[1] They must set forth in life and teaching the highest moral ideals, which are the Christian ideals of righteousness.[2] These they must apply to all social relationships, and so influence for the best the social life of the people.

IV

The teaching of our Lord upon the right relationship between the citizen and the State must, again, be gathered from two sources: first, from His own conduct; secondly, from any references in His teaching to the duties, obligations, and qualifications for earthly citizenship. His teaching upon these, we shall find, is generally closely connected with His teaching upon the 'Kingdom of God,' the only rule or power from which we may hope for the establishment of the ideal State.[3]

His own life and conduct were always those of the

[1] St. John vii. 38. The believer in Christ should himself become an abounding source of spiritual influence and blessing to others. Here 'spiritual' includes the highest conceivable moral.

[2] Note L.

[3] See Additional Note.

strictly law-observing citizen. And we may assume that Jesus saw the hand and will of God in the Roman conquest and rule of Palestine just as clearly as Jeremiah[1] saw these in the Babylonian overlordship in his day. Jesus absolutely refused even to lend an ear to any revolutionary suggestions or schemes.[2] Again, in one so transparently truthful as Jesus was, the comprehensive rule expressed in the saying, 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's,'[3] implied the fulfilment of every obligation of good citizenship. Also the authority assigned by Him to the second 'great' commandment—'as being no less radical and fundamental than the first'—must not be forgotten;[4] for this commandment, as our Church Catechism points out,[5] comprehends every requirement of good citizenship. The parable of the Good Samaritan,[6] which forms a commentary upon this commandment, shows how far our Lord was from being satisfied with any merely negative or passive interpretation of it; for instance, such a one as that attributed to Hillel, 'What is hateful

[1] Jeremiah at once grasped the significance of the Chaldaean victory at Carchemish (chap. xxv.); 'afterwards he taught explicitly that the safety of Judah lay . . . in accepting the condition of dependence on Babylon' (Driver, *Jeremiah*, p. xxix). See especially Jer. xxvii. 1 ff.

[2] St. John vi. 15; xviii. 36.

[3] St. Matt. xxii. 21.

[4] St. Matt. xxii. 39, *ὁμοία*='equivalent in authority.'

[5] In 'My Duty to my Neighbour.'

[6] St. Luke x. 30 ff., note in verse 36, *πλησίον . . . γεγονέναι*,

to thee, do not that unto thy neighbour.' In Christ's appeal for righteousness[1] (of which justice is the chief factor)—an appeal expressed in conduct as well as in word—we have asserted the claim of the fundamental principle and chief application of all good citizenship. Also, we must remember that the great majority of our Lord's hearers at least professed to be bound by the Old Testament, which contains the Law, and the largest part of the Law may be said to be concerned with the duties and requirements of citizenship.[2] He came 'not to destroy but to fulfil that Law.' 'What is written in the Law?' was His question. Hence He assumes, not only a knowledge of the Law, but the obligation of obedience to its precepts.

From His behaviour during the different trials which immediately preceded His death we may learn much about our Lord's own attitude towards the State. Take the record of St. John and contrast Christ's conduct with that of His accusers and judges. From that contrast we may see very clearly in what good and what bad citizenship consists. Christ does not question the authority of His judges,

[1] *e.g.* St. Matt. vi. 33. (Absolute righteousness as being God's); cp. chap. v. 6, 20. See Note M.

[2] As a proof of this let anyone take the 'Synopsis of Laws in Deuteronomy with the parallels in JE and P' (printed in Driver's *Deuteronomy*, pp. iv. ff.) and then abstract the laws relating to 'civil' conduct; the number left will be very few.

but, both explicitly and implicitly, He calls upon them to exercise it justly;[1] for only through the *just* exercise of authority can the State retain the confidence of its citizens; and upon this confidence, which issues in respect for law and order, the stability, and so the welfare, of the State depends. As the father to the child, so should the State to the citizen represent the Divine authority; and the State must be regarded as the instrument through which that authority is exercised; hence, as in the case of the father, its immense responsibility. Through its duly chosen and appointed representatives, the State should show that at least it understands before it judges, that is, before it either acquits or condemns. I have certainly no wish to read into words a meaning which they cannot legitimately bear, but in the answer of Jesus to the not more than half-serious question of Pilate, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?'—I refer to the words 'Sayest thou this of thyself or did others tell it thee concerning Me?'[2]—in this sentence we have, I think, a very strong rebuke of the acceptance and use of phrases which have little or no meaning to us. To use, if not meaningless, at least only half-considered phrases is all too common a practice in

[1] St. John xviii. 21, 23, 34; xix. 11.

[2] St. John xviii. 33, 34. 'If he admits the alleged assumption of the title to be a crime, he must ask himself whether the title has any meaning to him?' (Westcott *in loc.*).

politics. It is, alas! not unknown in religion, and especially in ecclesiastical controversy. The acceptance of these ill-considered phrases, which are often mere party catch-words, if not party missiles, issues in ill-thought-out action.[1] Both the citizen in his individual capacity and the State in its collective capacity must constantly appeal, as Christ does, to knowledge, to the reason, and the conscience.[2] 'Ask them that heard Me what I spake unto them;' 'If I have done evil bear witness of the evil, but if well, why smitest thou Me?' These are the appeals which Jesus makes, and they are appeals at once to knowledge and to justice. Before a phrase (however attractive and useful), which should represent and imply a working principle, is accepted, it is necessary that both its meaning should be studied, and the issues of its popular acceptance be carefully considered. It is not only here that Jesus, tacitly and implicitly, rebukes the want of a spirit of seriousness, shown by appeals to popular prejudice, which is generally only another name for popular ignorance. We know only too well, both from history and experience, the far-reaching consequences for evil which the want of this spirit of seriousness may

[1] Many of such phrases *were* alive once: they have since become petrified: to hurl 'petrified fragments' at others may result in serious consequences, not only to them, but to ourselves.

[2] St. John xviii. 21, 23; cp. St. Matt. xxvi. 55. The silences of Jesus were appeals to the conscience of His judges.

have upon both legislative and administrative action.[1] Then, in this want of seriousness there is a want of the highest morality, there is a want of a sense of responsibility towards the community and its welfare; there is also a want of truth and justice, frequently also a want of faithfulness and mercy. The relationship between the citizen who does not take the responsibilities of his citizenship seriously and the State must be wrong.[2]

In the saying of Jesus, 'Thou wouldest have no power' (or authority) 'against Me except it were given thee from above; for this reason he that delivered Me unto thee hath greater sin'[3]—in this saying there is a strong exhortation to us to consider all exercise of power or authority, whether it be that of the individual voter or speaker, or that of the State acting through its representatives, as the employment of a part of the Divine power. The dangers of the misuse, through ignorance or carelessness, of some kinds of physical force,

[1] A political or ecclesiastical 'party cry' may be supposed to embody a principle or an inspiration to action. What proportion of those who use or echo such a cry have made any attempt to judge the probable issues of its adoption?

[2] Note N.

[3] St. John xix. 11. 'Pilate's right to exercise authority was derived, not inherent. Human Government is only valid as the expression of the Divine Will. . . . The High-Priest was doubly guilty (Μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει) both in using wrongfully a higher (spiritual) power and in transgressing his legitimate rules of action' (Westcott *in loc.*).

are clearly known; unfortunately people do not realize the still greater dangers attending the misuse of other kinds of force.[1] Responsibility in the one case is much more widely recognized than it is in the other. Both the citizen towards the State and the State towards all its citizens are meant to be 'God's ministers for *good*.'[2] And God's purpose is entirely moral, for it is nothing else than righteousness; so must theirs be. In our Lord's great asseveration to Pilate, 'To this end have I been born and to this end am I come into the world, to bear witness to the truth,' we have gathered up in a single sentence the whole purpose of His mission. 'The truth in conduct' is the ideal, it is what should be, for it is that which is in perfect accordance with the Divine Will. The fickle and irresponsible mob, the jealous priests whose hatred is concentrated in that of Annas and Caiaphas, Herod the feeble King, the time-serving and self-serving Roman Governor, are all what those in their position should *not* be; hence they are lies. It is in the contrast which Jesus presents to each—for He stands there in His human nature as the perfect

[1] It seems to be extremely difficult for the majority of people to realize the process of causation outside the physical sphere. They act as if it did not exist, *e.g.* in the mental and moral spheres. They see no analogy whatever between explosive material in physical elements and explosive material in society.

[2] Rom. xiii. 4. See Note O.

citizen of the Ideal State, and in His kingly authority (which He does not deny)[1] as that State concentrated in Himself—it is in the contrast which Jesus presents to each that we have the proof of His claim to be 'the Truth.' In His discharge of the functions of both subject and ruler He is the embodiment of the great moral virtues of righteousness and justice, of respect for authority, and of deep responsibility for its due exercise.

In the Acts and Epistles the teaching upon the right relationship of the citizen to the State is usually extremely clear. From the position of the early Christians, questions touching this relationship were constantly bound to arise in a very practical form. Take the following striking instance, one which raises the question whether it may not be the duty of citizens, acting under a deep sense of their responsibility to God, to resist an unrighteous interference on the part of the authorities, and to do this by a course of conduct which these same citizens feel is for the highest welfare of the community; the ground of their disobedience being, that they are convinced that this discharge of their duty to the community is a far more highly moral course of conduct than is the action of the official rulers, and than what obedience to these would be. I refer to the refusal of St. Peter and St. John to cease from

[1] St. John xviii. 36 (note the word *ὑπηρέτης*).

speaking in the name of Jesus, and to their saying to the rulers, 'Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard.'[1] While, on the one hand, obedience to duly constituted authority is constantly enjoined in the New Testament,[2] it is quite clearly proved by history that, so far as we can judge, many a forward step in the progress of both Christianity and Civilization has been won only by resistance to such authority. Was not such resistance the cause of almost all the martyrdoms,[3] and has not the blood of the martyrs been the most fruitful seed of the Church? The real question, I believe, is that of the highest morality; and to us the standard of morality must be the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. For instance, the relationship between Elijah or Amos and the community of Israel was a much more moral one than that between Ahab or Amaziah and the people: so was the relationship between Luther and the German people a more highly moral one than that between the Catholic princes of the Empire and the same people. In reference to the conduct of the Apostles on the

[1] Acts iv. 19, 20.

[2] *e.g.* St. Matt. xvii. 24, xxii. 21; Rom. xiii. 1 ff.; 1 Pet. ii. 13; &c.

[3] Christianity was a *religio illicita*: to refuse to worship the 'genius' of the Emperor was to act as a rebel to the State.

particular occasion we are considering, a further point must not be forgotten. The Apostles were by that time fully convinced that Jesus was the Messiah, and that they were His chosen instruments for the establishment of His Kingdom; in other words, that under God's ordering, Jesus was the supreme ruler over God's covenant people, and that the High Priest and his adherents were acting as rebels[1] who were resisting their lawful King. The possibility of this may, I think, have crossed the mind of Gamaliel.[2] Then let us remember that these same Apostles had heard the lamentation (which was also of the nature of a judgment) of Christ over Jerusalem: 'If thou hadst known, even thou, in this thy day the things which belong unto peace!' Now 'the things which belong unto peace' must mean the mutual exercise of those virtues which were the essential virtues of the character of Christ—the Messiah, the Prince of Peace; and to these virtues the rulers were opposing themselves.[3]

I now turn to the teaching of St. Paul and to that of the first Epistle of St. Peter upon this same subject. The more we study the teaching of St.

[1] 'It was a misused *spiritual* authority, before which the protest had to be made' (Bishop Gore).

[2] Acts v. 34 ff.: notice especially verses 38, 39, *e.g.* Μή ποτε καὶ θεομάχοι εὑρεθῆτε.

[3] Note P.

Paul, the more clearly do we see how great was his respect for the outward framework, the legal constitution, of society. To him, at least ideally, the civil authority was the guardian and the champion of the moral and social virtues. Many books have been written upon St. Paul as a missionary, as a pastor, as a teacher; one might well be written upon him as a great, indeed, an ideal *citizen*.[1] Among the privileges he enjoyed, next to his Christian apostleship, he valued most his Roman citizenship. No one more thoroughly believed that the Empire was an instrument Divinely ordained for good. One of the ablest of modern students of St. Paul has taught us, that had the teaching and the principles of his statesmanship been carried out, the whole subsequent history of the Empire might have been altered.[2] What I would insist upon here is St. Paul's intense conviction that the relationship between the citizen and the State can only then be right when it is regarded as primarily a moral one, and with a view to a moral purpose.[3] Notice the repetition of the terms 'good' and 'evil' in the

[1] I have not forgotten Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, but this is rather of the nature of a commentary on a narrative than a picture of St. Paul from the particular point of view I have in mind.

[2] Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul*. See the section on 'Paulinism in the Graeco-Roman World,' especially §§ iii, vii, and viii.

[3] Rom. xiii. 3, *εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν* in verse 4; also *διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν* in verse 5.

earlier verses of the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and also the definite appeal for obedience 'for conscience sake.' Ideally, at least, the State is the moral agent of the Supreme Moral Ruler of the universe.[1] Therefore, the relationship between the whole and the parts must partake of its own nature. I would also draw your attention to the close proximity into which those of the Ten Commandments which forbid immoral (and therefore unsocial) relationships between man and man, and also the great comprehensive commandment (again both moral and social) 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' are brought with St. Paul's teaching upon the Imperial Authority. Only a single verse separates them.[2] What Dr. Moule well calls, 'the political principles of the new Faith'[3]—the conceptions of the Divine origin and the moral end of the supreme authority—are most closely connected with moral and social relationships enjoined by law, a law 'whose source is in the bosom of the Almighty,' and obedience to which is only the complete fulfilment of that most comprehensive of all social rules,[4] here quoted by St. Paul, 'Thou shalt

[1] Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν, verse 4. On κρίμα in verse 2 Bengel writes, '*judicium* divinum, per magistratum.'

[2] Viz. verse 8, and this verse dwells on a comprehensive social duty.

[3] *Romans*, p. 357.

[4] Verse 9, 'if there be any other commandment it is summed up in this word.'

love thy neighbour as thyself.' In short, we may say that St. Paul feels that it is the moralizing—to him the Christianizing—of the relationships between the citizen and the State, or the State and the citizen, and between one citizen and another, that is the true function of the law.[1] Only in the observance of these rules for the moralizing of conduct can the purpose of the State and of all law find its fulfilment.

The First Epistle of St. Peter evidently belongs to a period[2] when the relationship between the Christian citizen and the Imperial Authority had become much more difficult than it was when St. Paul wrote his letter to the Roman Christians. But St. Peter is not less convinced than was St. Paul that, whatever may be the action of the State, the conduct of the Christian must be governed entirely by the virtues characteristic of Christ.[3] A man may 'suffer as a Christian':[4] he must not suffer as anything else. There is a whole world of meaning in the charge, 'Sanctify Christ as Lord in

[1] Verse 10, *πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.*

[2] For a brief summary of various opinions as to the probable date of 1 Peter, see the article by Dr. Chase in Hastings' *Bib. Dict.*, vol. iii. p. 785. (A date c. A.D. 80 seems to suit best the contents and *tone* of the Epistle.)

[3] *e.g.* ii. 21 (*ὑπογραμμὸν*); iii. 8, 15, 17, 18; iv. 1, 14, 16.

[4] iv. 16, cp. verse 14 (*ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ*); to be a 'Christian' then implied much more than now. May not the 'name' imply the 'character'—a very special type of character, by no means common then?

your heart,'[1] for 'out of the heart are the issues of life.'[2] In more than one instance[3] St. Peter insists that whatever may be the action of others, the conduct of the Christian must invariably be ruled by the highest moral motives and standard; his behaviour must eminently be that of the good citizen.[4] He also believes that this setting forth of the highest example is the best of all means to get others to copy it; for it causes men to esteem highly the God of righteousness, and so His ordering of society.[5] We must remember that St. Peter commences his social teaching by laying stress upon the need of humility, which, in the Christian as in Christ, is to issue in useful service.[6] Subjection to various forms of State authority is to be rendered 'in loving imitation of Christ, and as a willing participation in His ministries.' The purpose which the various representatives of authority serve in God's order for the good of citizens must be recognized.[7] While the Christian is 'Christ's freeman,' he is yet the servant of God; as such he

[1] iii. 15. Place Christ as ruler at the source of all thought and conduct.

[2] Prov. iv. 23.

[3] ii. 20; iii. 14, 17.

[4] ii. 12, 13, 17, &c.

[5] ii. 12; iv. 11.

[6] ii. 13; iii. 8; sobriety in i. 13; obedience in i. 14; the child mind in i. 17, are all marks of humility.

[7] ii. 13.

must recognize God's 'instruments for good,' of which the State is the most important. He must through his relationship to the State—through his service to it and through his use of it—further the purpose of God, which purpose is righteousness.[1] How can he do this unless his relationship to the State is wholly moralized?

This teaching of St. Peter may suggest to us how to-day the State is actually becoming, if not the direct, yet, at least, the indirect means for promoting a higher morality. To-day we are constantly working more and more *through* the State for the abolition of much that tends toward immorality[2]—I use this word in its widest sense—and for the promotion of conditions in which the living of a moral life by all classes, but especially by the very poor, may become much more possible. This should be the issue of all laws for the promotion of temperance, for the better housing of the people, for reducing the hours of labour and for requiring at least a living wage, in short, for the removal of various forms both of disability and of temptation. And the right relationship

[1] ii. 14, 15. Note, εἰς . . . ἔπαινον ἀγαθοποιῶν; iv. 15, 16: instead of being guilty of unsocial sins let him glorify God, *i.e.* bring righteousness, the highest social conduct, into honour.

[2] Sin may be regarded as an active evil principle of life, to whose growth certain conditions (kinds of environment) are favourable. The State can do much to remove such conditions.

between the citizen and the State will be seen, not only in his efforts to promote legislation having this object, but to secure its due administration.[1] On the other hand, the right relationship of the State to the citizen is seen in the coming of such legislation into existence, the State being, from one point of view, both a public conscience and a public will for the good of all the individuals of whom it is composed. The greatest of all dangers lies in the slackness, in the want of the discharge of the responsibility of the individual. What it is everybody's duty to do, is too often done by no one. The State as an instrument for good is not used ; it falls into contempt. To rouse citizens to do their duty so far as to see that the conditions of life are, through the State, made such that it is as easy as possible for everyone to do right, and as hard as possible for anyone to do wrong, is one of the most urgent of all present duties.[2]

[1] The evil results of the apathy of the average citizen in regard to the due administration of existing laws are far greater than we imagine. The appointment of a stipendiary magistrate, independent of local political and social influences, in our smaller towns would tend to a far more efficient administration of the law than generally exists. One of the duties of citizenship to-day is to press for such appointments.

[2] Note Q.

V

Upon the last relationship which I considered in the two previous lectures—that of one State or nation to another—naturally comparatively little is found in the New Testament. For, if the New Testament was written for all time, like every other really useful book which ever has been written, it was primarily written to supply the needs, as it was primarily inspired by the conditions, of its *own* time. And, as those to whom its various writings were addressed were living in the midst of the *Pax Romana*, questions of international relationships could hardly greatly trouble them. This, however, may certainly be said: the New Testament everywhere lays the greatest possible stress upon the duty of cultivating the peaceful temper,[1] which surely may be cultivated by aggregates of men as well as by individuals. It also frequently states that the causes and the conditions of peace are moral.[2] Think once more of that touching exclamation of Jesus over Jerusalem, 'If thou hadst known, even thou, the things which belong unto peace!'[3] and remember that this exclamation was followed by

[1] *e.g.* St. Matt. v. 9; St. Mark ix. 50; Rom. xiv. 17, 19; 1 Cor. vii. 15; Col. iii. 21; Heb. xii. 14.

[2] The salt of self-sacrifice (St. Mark ix. 50); the kingdom (rule) of God (Rom. xiv. 17); unbelief prevents peace (1 Cor. vii. 15).

[3] St. Luke xix. 42.

Christ's prophecy of the Roman war, with all its attendant horrors, which occurred forty years later. There can be no doubt that by 'the things which belong unto peace,' Jesus implied the very opposite of those qualities which were so much in evidence in the Jews' treatment of Himself at that time—jealousy, narrow-mindedness, injustice, cruelty, and vindictiveness.

There is one book in the New Testament—the Apocalypse—in which we hear much of the sound of war.[1] It is a book full of highly figurative language, in which spiritual forces are described by strongly objective pictures.[2] But may not the very vividness of its imagery impress upon us how, behind the glamour and glitter of war, as well as before its sad and terrible results, there are at work those evil spirits which are its true motive forces?[3] Does it not teach us, as perhaps no other book does, a lesson we sorely need to learn, that the spiritual and the unseen, far from being the unreal, are the most real things in life?[4] Does it not teach us, by the horrors it describes, the duty of the conquest and abolition of those spirits of which these horrors

[1] πολεμεῖν occurs six times in the Apocalypse, once in the New Testament outside it; πόλεμος occurs nine times in the Apocalypse, seven times in the rest of the New Testament.

[2] Chap. xii. 7 ff. 'Another *tableau*, not a σημεῖον' (Swete *in loc.*).

[3] 'Michael and his angels fought . . . and the Dragon fought and his angels' (xii. 7).

[4] From chap. i. 8 onwards.

of war are the result?[1] Finally, does it not assert that the gathering together of the nations unto war, at the instigation of the great Deceiver,[2] is the last protest against the reign of Messiah, the Prince of Peace? As surely as St. Paul asserts the need of the conditions making for peace as being essential for the cultivation of the Christian life,[3] so just as clearly does the Apocalypse describe the spirits of enmity[4] as the real foes of Christian progress.

We may be tempted to speak of the 'purifying' action of war, as we speak of a storm 'clearing the atmosphere'; we may quote instances of war calling out the virtues of courage, of self-sacrifice, of the noblest patriotism; but we have only to think of scenes at home which accompanied, and results which followed, the last war in which this country was engaged to remember its *demoralizing* influences. The reign of Christ assumes international as well as civil peace. It implies the existence of such moral qualities as make war impossible: it implies that these same moral qualities—the characteristic virtues of Christ—must sanctify all social relationships—those on the largest as well as those on the narrowest scale.

[1] Of Christ's own part in this conflict, ii. 16; xix. 11.

[2] Chap. xx. 7 ff. *πλανῆσαι τὰ ἔθνη*: cp. St. John viii. 44.

[3] 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

[4] The spirits are the motive powers of sin: they are sins in the sense in which we speak of 'the sin of envy,' 'the sin of hatred,' 'the sin of selfishness,' &c.

From this necessarily brief review of the teaching of the New Testament upon various social relationships we may, I think, again assert, that not only do we find their nature and quality, as also the spirit and manner in which they are discharged, regarded as of primary importance; we also find ample proof of the truth of my thesis—that, here as certainly as in the Old Testament, we are taught that the true welfare of all forms of society depends upon the nature of these relationships being, in the fullest sense of the word, Christian. And to know what Christianity is we must, as I have so often stated, study the life, the conduct, and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ, as these are revealed to us in the Gospels. Of these love is the basis and the motive power and the all-comprehensive spirit; with love goes humility, issuing in self-sacrificing service; and the chief marks of the service rendered by Christ are its faithfulness, its single-mindedness, and its purity. The final object of Christ is righteousness, in which justice and mercy, truth and honesty, gentleness and patience are the all-prevailing notes.

NOTES TO LECTURE III

NOTE A. *Social Relationships in Tobit and Ecclesiasticus.* The book of Tobit probably belongs to the second half of the second century B.C., while the Greek Ecclesiasticus may be placed between B.C. 130 and 120, the Hebrew original being some fifty years older. Both contain many lessons on the right discharge of various social relationships. The following may be cited from Tobit:—

(α) Kindness to the poor: i. 16; ii. 2; iv. 7 ff.; iv. 16; xii. 8; &c.

(β) Purity of the marriage tie: iii. 14; iv. 12; viii. 6 ff.; &c.

(γ) Duty to parents: iv. 3, 4; &c.

(δ) Duty to those employed by us: iv. 14; &c.

(ε) Love of children: v. 17 ff.; x. 3 ff.; &c.

Ecclesiasticus, of course, is, like the book of Proverbs, full of ethical precepts, a great many of which bear upon the various social relationships. Possibly the greatest blot upon the book, from a Christian point of view, as Nestle points out, is the author's low estimate of woman: xxv. 13 ff.; yet see xxvi. 1 ff., 13 ff. The treatment of the subject of trade, *i.e.* of the ethics of buying and selling, is very full. The following are only a few out of many sayings bearing upon the various social relationships:—

(α) Treatment of parents: iii. 3 ff.; vii. 27; &c.

(β) Treatment of the poor: iv. 1 ff.; vii. 32; xxix. 1 ff., 9 ff.; &c.

(γ) The morals of trade: v. 8; vii. 15; x. 27; xi. 18; xiii. 3 ff.; xix. 1; xxvi. 29; &c.

(δ) Treatment of children: vii. 23; xxx. 1 ff.; &c.

(ε) Purity of the marriage tie: ix. 1 ff.; xxiii. 16 ff.; &c.

(ζ) The peaceful temper: xxviii. 8 ff.; &c.

NOTE B. *Jewish Piety at the Time of the Nativity.* 'In the generation from which Jesus sprang, there was, amid national circumstances closely resembling those in which the Second Isaiah was written, a counterpart of that Israel within Israel which the prophet has personified in Isa. xlix. The holy nation lay again in bondage to the heathen . . . and Israel's righteousness, redemption, and ingathering were once more the questions of the day. The thoughts of the masses, as of old in Babylonian days, did not rise beyond a political restoration. . . . But around the temple, and in quiet recesses of the land, a number of pious Israelites lived on the true milk of the word, and cherished for the nation hopes of a far more spiritual character' (G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. ii. pp. 281, 282).

NOTE C. *Christ's Teaching upon the Family.* 'We are struck at once by the extraordinary emphasis repeatedly laid by Jesus on the institution of the family. . . . Toward the politics, the larger social institutions, and even the theological issues of His time, His attitude was, as a rule, one of extraordinary reserve. . . . On the other hand, with quite unparalleled fulness of detail, the teaching of Jesus deals with the nature and obligations of the family. With unusual identity of language the first three gospels record His sayings on this subject, and their reiteration of the teaching indicates how profound an impression it originally made. Still further this is

the only aspect of social life concerning which Jesus descends from the announcing of general principles to the further duty of prescribing specific legislation' (Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, pp. 145, 146).

NOTE D. *Christian Ideas of Marriage and the Family.* My lecture was written before Canon Ottley's *Christian Ideas and Ideals* was published. I am very glad to see how closely we agree upon Christian marriage as 'a school of character,' and also upon the *apparently* diverse influences which are to-day acting with identical results upon both the ideas and the ideals of marriage and family life. I say 'apparently diverse' because, on the one hand, the teaching of a few extreme socialists, though *professing* to be a protest *against* individualism, is really a plea on its behalf; on the other hand, as Canon Ottley writes, 'the *practical* tendency of recent changes has been in the direction of protecting and providing scope for individuality' (p. 310).[1] While we must be careful not to judge, and still more careful not to condemn a great movement by the worst feature connected with it, especially if that feature is simply an accretion and not of the essence of the movement, it is impossible, I fear, to doubt that there is not a little selfishness—a perverted individualism—connected with some socialism; and that, 'at the back of the minds' of at least a few of those who to-day are promoting socialism, there is a hope that it may remove from them burdens which, I firmly believe, God intended them to bear. It is here that socialism is liable to be charged with being 'individualism run mad.'

[1] The whole of § ii of chap. xvi should be carefully read.

We must, however, as I have more than once pleaded in these lectures, be careful not to demand of people that they shall bear burdens which, through no fault of their own, but through the fault of circumstances, that is, through much which exists in the present industrial organization of society, it is well nigh, if not wholly, impossible for them to bear.

NOTE E. *Socialism, Marriage, and the Family.* Undoubtedly to-day 'socialism' is, in the minds of many, inevitably connected with attempts to weaken, if not destroy, the marriage tie: I have actually seen it charged with promoting what is termed 'free love'; it is also stated that its aim is entirely to abolish the family. Undoubtedly certain socialistic writers have expressed views upon marriage and the family which every Christian must without hesitation and without reserve utterly condemn; but to say that such views are 'inevitably connected with socialism,' or that they are held by more than a very small body of socialists (and those mostly of German origin), is untrue. As a specimen of the views to which I allude we may take the following: 'The socialist . . . no more regards the institution of marriage as a permanent thing than he regards a state of competitive industrialism as a permanent thing . . . in the social sphere, whether socialists succeed altogether or fail altogether, or in whatever measure they succeed or fail, it does not alter the fact that the family is weakening, dwindling, breaking up, and disintegrating. . . . The children people bring into the world can be no more their private concern entirely than the disease-germs they disseminate or the noises a man makes in a thin-floored flat. Socialism says boldly, the State is

the Over-Parent, the Outer-Parent. People rear children for the State and the future. . . . Under the State a woman will control her child's upbringing. How far her husband will share in the power of direction is a matter of detail upon which opinion may vary . . .' (H. G. Wells, *Socialism and the Family*, pp. 39 ff.).[1]

I will now take another socialist writer and leader, Mr. J. R. Macdonald, M.P.; this is how he writes upon 'Socialism and the Family': 'The idea that socialism is opposed to the family organization is equally absurd. . . . Nowhere and at no time was the abolition or even the weakening of the family incorporated in the socialist creed. . . . To-day one of the first cares of socialism is to protect what remains of the family and rebuild what has fallen down. In the first place, it is evident that the family cannot last except upon a firm economic basis and under healthy and moral circumstances. . . . The State, in its own interests, will do everything it can to develop individuality in its children. . . . The personal touch and affection of the mother, the surroundings and ethics of a small community, the sense of continuity which comes to the maturing child's mind from a personal organization like the family, are all invaluable to a State. . . . Further, the settling influences of family responsibilities on adults, particularly the care and interest it gives them in training the next generation, . . . must ever be valued by a State which guards its own stability and seeks to preserve a continuity in its evolution. The family is inseparable from a complete socialistic

[1] It is only fair to say that the context considerably modifies the apparent meaning of this extract.

organization. So much is this the case that I can imagine a time when, the marriage choice being absolutely one of free-will, and the stability of family life having proved itself to be essential to the stability of State life, the socialist State will decline to recognize divorce altogether as being too subversive to its policy' (*Socialism*, in 'the Social Problems Series,' pp. 94 ff.).

I would also adduce the following: 'It is still by many believed that socialism tends to subvert the family and the Christian ideal of marriage. Some of the leading socialist writers have indeed enunciated theories at variance with these institutions. But it should be remembered that such opinions are not peculiar to socialism, and that they have been most strenuously opposed within the socialist schools. As a theory of economic organization we cannot see that socialism can have any special teaching adverse to marriage and the family, on the contrary it should tend to purify and elevate both, by eliminating the mercenary element so common in the marriages of the present day, by relieving the drudgery of women, both indoors and out of doors, and by abolishing prostitution—that vilest plague-spot of the existing society. . . . At present love, marriage, and the family are too much perverted by the mercenary spirit, which it is a chief aim of socialism to repress. To what baneful extent the Christian family has been injured by the employment of women—especially married women—in factories and mines we need not repeat here. The economic reforms and ethical tendencies of socialism should directly and powerfully tend to remove the worst evils connected with the mutual life of men and women' (Kirkup, *An Enquiry into Socialism*, pp. 119, 120).

NOTE F. *Preserving the Integrity of the Family.* The Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission claims that this will be one of the effects of the preventive treatment of pauperism which they so strongly urge. 'Owing to the unfortunate limitation of the action of the Board of Guardians to the period of actual destitution, thousands of families are disintegrating to-day under our eyes, from lack of the timely strengthening which might have prevented them from becoming destitute. . . . When the cost and trouble of providing for the several members of the family when destitute, fall upon committees which have, as part of their ordinary duty and machinery, the periodical visitation of the home, irrespective of destitution, these committees will have the families continuously under observation. . . . Thus the several committees of the Town Council—as a mere measure of economy, so as not eventually to incur the cost of institutional treatment, with its concomitant of "breaking up the family"—will be perpetually doing whatever may be necessary to maintain the family intact, to encourage those members of it who are striving to keep the home together, and forcibly to restrain any member whose conduct is threatening it with ruin' (*Minority Report*, cap. xii. G. i.).

NOTE G. '*Father*' *and* '*Family*' (πατριὰ), in Eph. iii. 15. Because I think it so important to remember the Divine source and archetypes of our family relationships, I would quote these two notes upon this verse of Bishop Westcott:—

(1) 'The absolute title [The Father] expresses an important truth. . . . He Who is the Father of men is also the source of fellowship and unity in all the orders of

finite being. The social connections of earth and heaven derive their strength from Him; and represent under limited conditions the power of His Fatherhood.'

(2) 'Every family,' every society, which is held together by the tie of a common head and author of its being, derives that which gives it a right to the title from the one Father. From Him comes the spirit by which the members have fellowship one with another and are all brought into a supreme unity.'

NOTE H. *Intelligent Co-operation.* There is no social purpose towards which we need to work at once more zealously and more carefully at the present time than for a more intelligent co-operation between employers and employed. In his notes on St. John xv. 15, Bishop Westcott points out that, 'At the very moment of action (ποιεῖ = "is doing") there is no sympathy between the lord and the slave, by which the mind of one is known to the other. The slave is an instrument (ἔμψυχον ὄργανον), not a person.' Then he notices how in the second clause our Lord changes the order of the words, ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴρηκα φίλους; 'The emphasis is laid on the personal character of the eleven.' [This is only one of the numberless cases in which we arrive at true principles of action by the most accurate study of the language of the New Testament.]

At present, owing to changes in organization in modern industry, this intelligent co-operation is becoming more and more difficult; indeed, in many branches of industry intelligence itself is becoming less and less required. In the days of the craftsman with a few assistants and apprentices intelligent co-operation was possible. How is it possible to-day in a huge, highly

differentiated, manufacturing and distributing concern? In the making of a single article there are, say, a hundred processes, each of which is continuously performed by one set of workpeople. Take the much vexed question of the workman receiving a fair share of the profits of his labour: how can the man who—say, in a boot-factory—works all day at the 'lightning heeler' estimate his share of the profit on the finished article? The workman feels he is a machine hired at too low a price. The master (except in a few instances) does not wish to purchase intelligence or originality: the more mechanical the work of the majority of his employees is the better for his interest. The workman has no chance of improving at his craft or of rising in his calling. With a few weeks' practice he can do what is required as well as it can be done. He has neither incentive nor hope. He feels the master is exploiting his labour. His temptation is to do as little as possible. The master's temptation is so far to perfect his machinery as to be as independent as possible of human labour. Where in all this is the incentive, even the opportunity, for intelligent co-operation? It is extremely difficult for the workers in the higher callings—the clergyman, the lawyer, the doctor, the teacher, the literary man, the artist, the merchant, even the manager and foreman, who have all much incentive and endless variety in their work—to realize at once the monotonousness and helplessness of the lives of thousands of workers to-day.

NOTE I. Heb. iii. 2–6. In this passage the following points should be noticed:—

(1) The human name (Ἰησοῦν) suggests the conduct of our Lord as an example for us.

(2) ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, v. 2: Christ and Moses were engaged with the whole 'economy' of God: the reference of αὐτοῦ to God favours the reference of these words to 'Jesus.'

(3) θεράπων: suggests 'a personal service freely rendered.'

(4) The 'house of God' is the organized society in which God dwells. This is the Christian community. Thus the service is to be (1) willing, (2) personal, and (3) social.

NOTE J. *Dr. Dale on Eph. vi. 5–9.* Dr. Dale devotes a whole chapter in his *Lectures on the Ephesians* to these verses, and the chapter is one of the most valuable in an exceptionally valuable book. He points out what a 'dangerous topic' 'slavery' was for the Christian teacher; how St. Paul 'takes the institutions of society as they stand and defines the duties of those who acknowledge the authority of Christ'; how 'domestic and industrial institutions are necessary for the existence of society'; and how 'by the Divine constitution of human life we have to serve each other in many ways,' and that 'if the service is to be effective it must be organized'; and lastly, how 'St. Paul transfigures the institution [of slavery] by applying to it the great principle which underlies all Christian ethics, that Christ is the true Lord of human life, and whatever we do we are to do for Him, for we are all His servants.' He then proceeds to show that while 'we are happily free from the curse and crime of slavery, . . . the social order of England, which we are accustomed, very inconsiderately, to call a Christian country, does not perfectly realize the ideal of social justice.'

NOTE K. *The Practical Issues of the Doctrine of the Incarnation.* It is impossible to exaggerate the effects for good which a more careful study of the meaning and issues of the Incarnation has, of late years, had upon the work of the Church; it is equally impossible to exaggerate the extent to which these benefits might be increased by a wider study of the implications of this great doctrine. The effects of the growing realization of its infinite importance upon Christian theological and social literature issued during, say, the last twenty-five years are abundant. Perhaps the clearest of all statements of its bearing upon the daily life of the Christian and of the Christian Society is that contained in a charge delivered by Bishop Westcott in 1892—'The Incarnation a Revelation of Human Duties' (reprinted in *The Incarnation and Common Life*). The following sentences will serve to indicate the bishop's faith and line of argument: 'The Incarnation of the Word of GOD becomes to us, as we meditate upon the fact, a growing revelation of duties personal, social, national: it is able by its all-pervading influence to mould to noblest ends the character of men and classes and peoples. . . . The Incarnation hallows labour and our scene of labour. It claims the fullest offering of personal service. It embraces all men in the range of its greatest hope, and not only those who have reached a particular stage of culture' (pp. 43 and 47). With this should be compared Dr. Westcott's commentary upon St. John i. (1–18). I would also venture to mention a little booklet of my own, *The Christian View of Man* (published by Longmans).

NOTE L. *The Christian Ideal and the Work of*

the Clergy. I would define the Christian Ideal, that is the object each Christian should set before himself for realization, as a life of progressive and perpetual growth into likeness to the life of God Himself; this ideal he is also bound to set before others. The life of God has been manifested unto us in the life of Jesus Christ. Of that life the ministers of Christ must bear witness; they must declare it. Because they would also have others to have the same ideal as themselves, they will strive to bring these into fellowship with themselves and also with God; and the 'fulfilment of Christian joy depends upon the realization of fellowship.' Cp. 1 John i. 1 ff.

To the realization of this ideal, which is thus seen to be at once personal and social, the life of the minister of Christ must be dedicated.

1. Upon 'Ideals' I would advise everyone to read an address with that title by Bishop Westcott, printed in *The Incarnation and Common Life*, pp. 141 ff. The following sentences should be remembered: 'Ideals are, I say, the soul of life . . . they support us, and still more, they rule us. It is, then, momentous that we should pause from time to time to regard our ideals. They exercise their influence upon us insensibly. . . . There is but one ideal in which we can find rest—that which answers to the truth of things . . . we were born to seek it, to find it, to recognize it, to show it.'

Upon our duty to try to get others to share the highest ideals, the Bishop says: 'It is, I believe, by the help of these noblest ideals—ideals which belong to men as men, the ideals of our Christian faith—that purity and peace and freedom and dignity will be given to the masses of our countrymen. . . . All who share our nature are

capable of our highest visions, and awakened reverence will do her perfect work.'

2. Upon the 'Dedicated Life' I would strongly recommend an address with that title by the Right Hon. R. B. Haldane (published by Murray). Of the dedicated life Mr. Haldane gives two definitions :—

(1) 'A life into which our whole strength is thrown, in which we look neither to the right nor to the left, if to do so is to lose sight of duty—such a life is a dedicated life' (p. 22).

(2) 'As the Truth never stands still, but is in its nature a process of evolution, so the mind of the seeker after it can never stand still. . . . And it is in the devotion to this search after the Most High—a search which may assume an infinity of forms—that the dedicated life consists : the life dedicated to the noblest of quests and not to be judged by apparent failure to reach some fixed and rigid goal, but rather by the quality of its striving' (p. 28).

It was to a high moral and intellectual equipment, not for themselves alone but for the sake of the nation, that Mr. Haldane called upon his hearers—an audience of university students—to dedicate themselves. 'The foundation of purpose in the State . . . must, if the national life is to grow permanently . . . be ethical. . . . It is . . . moral power that commands predominance in the world. . . . Without moral and intellectual equipment of the highest order no nation can to-day remain a world power. . . . The first purpose of a nation ought to be to concentrate its energies on its moral and intellectual development.'

What I would urge is that the true relationship of

the clergy, who are pledged to live a 'dedicated life,' to the people is proved by their efforts to induce and encourage the people to strive after the realization of the highest—the Christian—ideal.

If we turn from the ideal to the actual, what apparently are the objects upon which the energies of the clergy to-day are being chiefly expended? Certainly no one can survey the life of the 'Churches' to-day without being struck with the immense amount of the energy that is being expended, the immense amount of 'work' that is being done. But these questions must be asked: What apparently are the objects, proximate and ultimate, upon which this energy is being spent? To what are the great majority of the clergy (as the representative Christian workers) mainly devoting themselves? Upon what do we find most of them spending the greater part of their time and thought?

From the New Testament we may learn a great deal about the pastoral work of both Christ and St. Paul, in other words, of their relationship to those among whom they ministered. We have also clear indications of the pastoral aims of St. Peter and St. John. Their objects are clear, so to some extent are the methods they employed. It cannot be unprofitable to compare our own with these.

The moment we do this we are struck with the elaborateness of our machinery, *alias* organization. Is this elaborateness inevitable? Is it possible that we are tempted to forget the purpose of the machine in our admiration of the machine itself? Is it possible that we may 'sacrifice unto our net and burn incense unto our drag' (Hab. i. 16)?

(1) Think of the time, thought, and money expended

upon Church services—multiplied services, elaborate services! What is the effect of these upon the *conduct* of the people? Judged by the ethical standard, the Puritans of the seventeenth century were far superior to the men and women of the days prior to the Reformation, when services were both many and exceedingly elaborate.

(2) Think of the popular, so-called 'institutional' Church of to-day, with its multiplication of methods for providing various kinds of recreation for the people, with also its efforts to find funds for all its various activities!

I would not question the usefulness of these. What I do question is the correctness of the relationship of the pastor to his people who expends his energies largely in multiplied services or in raising funds for 'running' these various institutions. I do question his conformity to the pastoral ideal of Christ and the Apostles. I do question whether, by forsaking immediate devotion to the highest moral and intellectual work, he is most usefully employing a 'dedicated life.' By doing this, is the pastor placing himself in the ideal, the true Christian relationship to his flock?

NOTE M. *Righteousness.* The New Testament conception of 'righteousness' is a subject upon which we need to think clearly, for only thus shall we realize the ethical supremacy of Christianity. The following train of thought may, I hope, prove helpful.

(1) God is absolutely righteous. Righteousness is that of which His nature and His character consists. As He is ἡ πηγή ζωῆς, so He is ἡ πηγή δικαιοσύνης. Therefore righteousness in men is the expression of God's nature in them and the doing by them of His will; for will is

character in action. To 'know' God is to know what righteousness is.

(2) Christ is the perfect Incarnation of God, therefore He is the perfect Incarnation of righteousness. As we learn to know God through Christ, so we learn to know righteousness from Christ.

(3) Christ tells us He is 'the Truth' and that He 'came to bear witness to the Truth.' Now truth is entire conformity to the absolute ideal: it is what ought to be; therefore it is what is according to the will of God; therefore truth is righteousness realized in life or expressed in conduct.

(4) But, besides being righteousness, God is love: therefore perfect righteousness is perfect love, or we may say that righteousness in conduct, that is, conformity to the will of God, is the issue of love. Thus, love to our neighbour (to all within the sphere of our influence) is conformity to the will of God.

(5) But God is 'spirit': therefore both righteousness and love are each a spirit, and among the marks of spirit seem to be (*a*) energy acting outwards from a source; (*b*) adaptability to all conditions and needs. True righteousness and true love have both of these 'notes.'

NOTE N. *The Responsibilities of Citizenship.* 'The citizens of the Roman Empire were loyal subjects . . . but they were not intelligent patriots, and chiefly because they were not the Empire fell. That active interest in the service of the State which makes patriotism in the better sense, can hardly arise while the individual's relation to the State is that of a passive recipient of protection in the exercise of his rights of person and

property. . . . If he is to have a higher feeling of political duty, he must take part in the work of the State. . . . Only thus will he learn to regard the work of the State as a whole, and to transfer to the whole the interest which otherwise his particular experience would lead him to feel only in that part of its work that goes to the maintenance of his own and his neighbour's rights' (T. H. Green, *Principles of Political Obligation*, p. 130).

NOTE O. *The State as God's Minister.* 'Civil order is not only a desirable thing, but divine; it is the will of God for the social Race made in His Image. In the abstract, this is absolutely so; civil order is a God-given law, as truly as the most explicit precepts of the Decalogue, in whose Second Table it is so plainly implied all along. And in the concrete, the civil order under which the Christian finds himself to be is to be regarded as a real instance of this great principle. It is quite sure to be imperfect, because it is necessarily mediated through human minds and wills . . . yet even under heavy pressure the Christian is still to remember that civil government is, in its principle, "of God." He is to reverence the Institution in its idea. . . . The most imperfect, even the most erring, administration of civil order is still a thing to be respected before it is criticized' (Bishop Moule, *Romans*, pp. 349, 350).

NOTE P. *The Disobedience of the Apostles to the Jewish Rulers.* In Acts iv. 19 it must be carefully noticed that the Apostles throw the responsibility of the choice between alternatives, which they have clearly explained, upon the Jewish rulers—κρίνατε. 'The maxim here expressed,' writes Meyer (*in loc.*), 'takes for granted

two things as certain; on the one hand, that something is really commanded by God; and, on the other hand, that a demand of the rulers does really cancel the command of God, and is consequently immoral; in which case the rulers actually and wilfully abandon their status as organs of Divine ordination, and even take up a position antagonistic to God. Only on the assumption of that twofold certainty could that principle lead Christianity, without the reproach of revolution, to victory over the world in opposition to the will of the Jewish and heathen leaders.' Meyer adds in a note, 'It is not the magisterial *command itself* and *per se* that is Divine, but the command for its *observance* is a Divine one, which therefore cannot be connected with immorality without doing away with its very idea as Divine.'

In his *Principles of Political Obligation*, T. H. Green writes (p. 111): 'The common good must suffer more from resistance . . . to the ordinance of a legal authority than from the individual's conformity to a particular law or ordinance that is bad, until its repeal can be obtained. But difficulties arise . . . when the authority from which the objectionable command proceeds is so easily separable from that on which the maintenance of social order and the fabric of settled rights depends, that it can be resisted without serious detriment to this order and fabric. In such cases may there not be a right of resistance based on a "higher law" than the command of the ostensible sovereign?'

The action of the Apostles appears to be one of these cases.

There is an interesting comment upon the action of the Apostles in F. D. Maurice's *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 56, 57, where he writes: 'No doubt they [vv. 19, 20]

are words capable of abuse, words which we may make our excuse for self-will and the indulgence of our individual fancies. . . . If we steadfastly believe that we are not to hearken to men more than to God, we shall be taught to listen with more real respect and deference to men than we ever did before; we shall ask God, and not in vain, to distinguish between His commands and our conceits; we shall dread these more than the opinions and the authorities which influence us most.'

NOTE Q. *State Interference.* From more than one point of view such questions as: What are the proper functions of the State? What should be the limits of State interference? are among the most widely debated of all questions at the present time. They lie at the root of the contest between individualism and socialism (or collectivism), though they do not cover the whole of the ground of controversy between these. That for many years we have been moving rapidly in the direction of a considerable enlargement of the functions of the State is clear; but that this necessarily means—as, for instance, Herbert Spencer so constantly contended—a proportionate lessening of the freedom of the individual, is by no means equally clear. That the enlargement of the area of State control implies a certain lessening of personal responsibility may possibly be conceded; but that this is necessarily detrimental to character, I would again contend, is by no means universally true. When responsibilities (or burdens) are increased beyond a certain point, instead of these being a valuable stimulus to effort, the result may be despair; the too heavily laden may from sheer hopelessness actually cease to make any effort at all.

Most people would admit that the object of all legislation should be 'to make it as easy as possible for people to do right, and as difficult as possible for them to do wrong'; the only limit being that we should not seek to remove from them the necessity for a sufficient measure of healthy effort after right. That there is any possibility of our being able to organize a social state, in which at least so much effort is unnecessary, few people, who know human nature and public life, will, after reflection, be prepared to admit.

The whole subject of the wise limit of State interference demands much more careful study by social workers and social reformers generally than it has as yet received. People are so apt to assume that the alternative lies only between the extremists on either side—*e.g.* between such men as Herbert Spencer, who condemned even Free Libraries, and the most advanced socialists.

It is quite easy, from both history and experience, to cite many cases in which State interference has proved extremely disastrous; but it is equally easy to cite just as many cases in which it has proved most beneficial. That the State should enact (as it has done in the past) that certain articles should be sold only at a certain price might prove disastrous to trade; instances of this effect are not wanting. On the other hand, that the State should interfere to protect the very poorest class of sweated workers, who work as isolated units, may be absolutely necessary. Again, that even as a policy of insurance for its own future welfare (to take a very selfish standpoint), it is necessary for the State to see that all children receive some education, most people would concede; but whether the making of elementary

education practically free to all has not lessened the interests of many parents in the education of their children is a very open question.

What I would most strongly urge is, that it is most unwise to set up sharply opposed principles and theories in this matter, and then to maintain that every contravention of the one, or application of the other, must necessarily have evil results. What we need is a much more careful study of the actual results of various instances of State intervention in the past, and a much more careful estimate of the probable issues of proposed further applications of the principle. The history of the struggle for and against the extension of State intervention in our own country during the last hundred years, which covers the three periods of (1) 'Legislative Quiescence,' (2) 'Benthamism and Individualism,' and (3) 'The Growth of Collectivism,' may be usefully studied in Dicey's *Law and Opinion in England*. There, largely from the point of view of the impartial historian, we may see how the tendencies or ideas of each period arose, not by revolutionary cataclysms, but, as it were, naturally out of the preceding period, and to supply deficiencies in it which had been revealed by the test of experience. For instance, the keynote of Benthamism was, as Dicey shows, 'utility.' But by experience the practice of *laissez faire* was proved not to be conducive to the widest utility; hence there gradually arose a conviction that utility might be better promoted by certain measures of State interference, which generally meant interference with the liberty (or licence) of a few people for the sake of the liberty of the many—*e.g.* the Factory Acts. Also, it was seen that the 'rights of the individual'—another article of the

Benthamite creed—meant the rights of *all* individuals, and therefore the wider extension of the franchise, which meant the opportunity for more people to assert their rights. Again, it was found that the principle of utility demanded an improvement in the working of that law-making machine called Parliament. 'Thus English Collectivists have inherited from their utilitarian predecessors a legislative doctrine, a legislative instrument, and a legislative tendency pre-eminently suited for the carrying out of socialistic experiments' (Dicey, *Law and Opinion in England*, p. 309).

Another point in connection with State interference is that it is not always realized how one change or advance implies (even demands) another. For instance, after it was decided that every child must receive a measure of education, which from one point of view may be regarded as an assertion of the right of every child to the possibility of self-development, it was seen that this opportunity for self-development implies, at any rate, sufficient food to maintain the child in a state of physical efficiency, which implies the responsibility, ultimately of the State, to see that the child is fed. This may be done in either of two ways: (1) by calling upon the parent to feed the child, and where this is impossible, for the State to feed it; or (2), as in the case of free education, by imposing a rate, by means of which each parent, according to his means, shall contribute to a common fund for the purpose. The first method is of course infinitely the best; where it breaks down is through the difficulty of administering the law, *e.g.* in compelling parents who can, and therefore ought to, feed their children properly, to do so.

When the administration of the law fails, it generally

does so from a want of a sense of responsibility on the part of the State towards the individual. Here we come to the subject and object of these lectures, namely the improvement of the various social relationships, and among them that of the State to the citizen. If this relationship between citizen and State were what it ought to be, one way in which each citizen would do his duty to the State would be by seeing that through a more adequate administration the State did its duty to each citizen. This is, of course, one great application of a universal Christian principle of 'service'—'wise and effective social service guided by science and the best available light.' There is no application of our Lord's words, 'I am among you as one that serveth,' more needed to-day than a really conscientious service of the State; there is no duty upon which the Christian teacher and preacher needs more frequently to dwell, for 'whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all.' 'Service rising up to self-sacrifice for the good of men is the ideal of the Christian life . . . the greatest and highest man in society is he who renders the best and noblest service; in the words of Louis Blanc, "The day will come when it will be recognized that each one's debt to his fellow-men is in proportion to the strength and intelligence he has received from God; and it will be a part worthy of genius to assert its legitimate empire, not by the amount of tribute it will levy on society, but by the greatness of the service that it will render to it"' (Kirkup, *An Enquiry into Socialism*, pp. 152 f.).

ADDITIONAL NOTE

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE IDEAL SOCIAL STATE

If an idea, however attractive and useful, or an interpretation, however plausible at first sight, will not stand the test of the most rigorous examination, we must relentlessly refuse to accept it. To-day we frequently find the phrase 'the kingdom of God' (or 'of heaven') interpreted as if it were almost, if not entirely synonymous with, 'the ideal social state.'

For instance, Prof. Shailer Mathews writes: 'By the kingdom of God Jesus meant an ideal (though progressively approximated) social order. . . . The Christian kingdom is the Jewish kingdom, but transfigured and made universal by the clarifications (*sic*) of Jesus. . . . As a new social order the kingdom of God had really begun to be appreciable if only men would so believe. . . . This conclusion, that by the kingdom of God Jesus meant a society, is confirmed by the position which the kingdom, as the ideal, occupies in relation to the world, as the actual social order.'[1]

Again, Prof. Rauschenbusch, after a lengthy review of our Lord's use of the term, writes: 'After all this has been said, it still remained a social hope, the kingdom of

[1] *The Social Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 56 ff.

God is still a collective conception involving the whole social life of man. It is not a matter of saving human atoms, but of saving the social organism. It is not a matter of getting individuals to heaven, but of transforming the life on earth into the harmony of heaven.'[1]

In an excellent essay on 'Christian Ethics,'[2] Canon Ottley speaks of 'the intermediate stage through which the kingdom of God is destined to pass'; he states that 'the last stage in the kingdom of God is one of glory'; he says that 'the kingdom of God is to be finally manifested in its true character'; and that 'it is to be purified through judgment.'

Sir John Seeley, after devoting two chapters to the subject, writes: 'We conclude, then, that Christ, in describing himself as a King, and at the same time as King of the kingdom of God—in other words, as a King representing the Majesty of the Invisible King of a theocracy—claimed the character first of Founder, next of Legislator, thirdly, in a certain high and peculiar sense, of Judge of a new Divine society.'[3]

Once more, Bishop Westcott says: 'The new kingdom of which He was the founder could not be comprehended till after a new birth . . . without this new birth no man can see—can outwardly apprehend—the kingdom of God'; 'the words [the kingdom of God] have always a twofold application, external and internal[4] . . . thus under the old dispensation the visible

[1] *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 65. (The preceding pages, from p. 54, should be carefully read.)

[2] *Lux Mundi*, pp. 513 ff.

[3] *Ecce Homo*, p. 38.

[4] Notice that Bishop Westcott puts 'external' before 'internal.'

Israel was the kingdom of God as typical of the visible catholic church, the spiritual Israel as typical of the true spiritual church' (Note on St. John iii. 3). On verse 5 he writes: 'They [the same words] contemplate the fulness of the organized life of the Christian society. . . . The image suggested by the words *enter into* is that of entering into the promised land—the type of the kingdom of heaven.'

These are examples of one class of expositions of the meaning of the phrase. I will now give instances of a different interpretation:—

Canon Ottley quite recently writes:[1] 'The kingdom is *a vital principle that works in human society like leaven*, as an element of change and disturbance; yet it is a kingdom making for regeneration, for spiritual order and efficiency.'

Harnack writes: 'The kingdom of God comes by coming to the individual, by entering into his soul and laying hold of it . . . *it is God Himself in His power*. . . . The kingdom has a triple meaning. Firstly, it is something supernatural, a gift from above, not a product of ordinary life; secondly, it is a purely religious blessing, the inner link with the living God; thirdly, it is the most important experience that a man can have, that on which everything else depends; it permeates and dominates his whole existence.'[2]

Principal A. M. Fairbairn says: 'The idea of the kingdom of God was the peculiar creation of Jesus. He did not make the phrase, but He made the thing. . . .

[1] *Christian Ideas and Ideals*, p. 111. (The italics are my own.—W. E. C.)

[2] *What is Christianity?* (Eng. Trans.) pp. 56, 62.

It was the reign of God in man, a state of righteousness, peace, love. The good it promised to all it was to accomplish by making all good. . . . It was not revolutionary in the political sense, yet it was the most radical of all political revolutions. It assailed no existing order, yet its aim was to create an absolutely new order by the creation of a new mankind.'[1]

Dr. A. B. Davidson writes: 'The kingdom of God in its perfection is not an immediate creation of God apart from men; it is not a great miraculous interference and exhibition of Divine power; *it is a slow growth of the mind of mankind*, through generation after generation of its life, and cycle after cycle of its history. Our Lord transfers the kingdom of God from heaven *into the mind* of mankind; and He translates it out of a sudden Divine operation *into a growth and progress of the human mind*.'[2]

To these testimonies I would add one more, and, I venture to think, a very striking one: 'We might say in general that the kingdom of God is simply and literally what the words express, not anything of God but God Himself in humanity. But if we should agree upon this, we should at once disagree upon what this means. With many it would mean no more than the prevalence and influence within each man of his own subjective conception of God. With others who have more of the sense of God as One with Whom we may hold objective relations, the kingdom of God will be an actual presence and operation of God in us, as we say, by His Spirit. And still others may go the whole length of holding the

[1] *The City of God*, pp. 241 ff.

[2] *Waiting upon God*, p. 206. (The italics are again mine. —W. E. C.)

kingdom of God to be that permanent and eternal incarnation of God in humanity, which we see not only realized in the individual person of Jesus Christ, but to be consummated in the universal humanity of which He is the head.' [1]

As much as this, I think, may certainly be asserted, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to find a single explanation of the term—the kingdom of God—which will cover every use of it either by Jesus or in the New Testament. In other words, it seems that Jesus Himself (if the record of His utterances is exact) used it at different times with a somewhat different signification. For instance, its meaning in the expressions, 'Thy kingdom come'; 'Seek ye first His kingdom'; 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven'; 'The kingdom of heaven is like leaven'; 'The kingdom of heaven is within you,' is different from its meaning in 'he who is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he' (St. Matt. xi. 11), or in 'they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling and them that do iniquity' (St. Matt. xiii. 41), and (possibly) in the words addressed to Nicodemus about 'seeing' and 'entering' the kingdom of God.

What, I think, we have to ask ourselves is, What is the *fundamental* or root idea in Jesus' use of the term? To this I believe we must reply, That which is expressed in the Lord's Prayer, where 'Thy kingdom come' seems certainly to be explained by 'Thy will be done.' Therefore, if we are faced by this alternative, Does the term, according to the use of Jesus, mean 'The rule of God within the heart of the individual,' or does it mean 'The

[1] Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 64.

Ideal Society'? we must answer, It means the first primarily, and if it ever actually means the second, it can mean only a society in which the rule of God is accepted and active in the heart of every member of which that society is composed.

The subject is of extreme importance in connection with what is termed 'social teaching,' and especially with much 'Christian social teaching' which is being given at the present time. Immense efforts are being made to-day after a better organization of society, and especially in order to obtain legislation which will tend to produce and maintain this better organization. In a hundred different ways energy is being expended to procure better conditions and improved social arrangements for the people. We are trying to make people educated, sober, pure, and peaceful by various Acts of Parliament. We are being told (and so far, I believe, told truly) that the welfare of society depends upon obedience to certain Divinely ordained laws as surely as physical health depends upon obedience to certain physical laws. We are also told, and again with a large measure of truth, that in proportion as statutory social laws approach the Divine social laws, so will the welfare of the people improve. But when we come to the corollary—assumed, if not explicitly asserted—'by these means we hope to inaugurate and establish an ideal society,' then at once it is our duty as Christians to say, You cannot do it, for you have left out of consideration the two most important factors in the problem: first, the power or force which alone will give you success; secondly, the power or force which all the time is defeating your object. Your mechanism, your organization, may be wonderfully perfect, but where is the power with which

you are going to set and keep it in motion? How are you going to counteract the effects of that other force, which will spoil the working of your organization as certainly as the action of the physical force called friction prevents the mechanician from achieving perpetual motion? This second force, of course, is *sin*; the first, I believe, is what Jesus primarily meant by 'the kingdom of God.' Only the term means more than the force; it seems to mean the Divine power, first possessed, and secondly exercised, *according to the Divine Will.* With this conviction the primary sense of the kingdom of God is what Canon Ottley terms 'a vital principle that works in human society,' only in his definition I should substitute 'human nature' for 'human society'; it is what Harnack means by '*God Himself in His power*'; it is what Dr. Fairbairn means by 'the reign of God in man'; it is what Prof. Du Bose means by 'God Himself in humanity.' Only through the action of this Divine power in the individual will 'the ideal social state' be established and maintained. In a true sense will such a State be the kingdom of God only when all its citizens shall recognize in practice (*de facto*) God as their sovereign. It has been well said that at first 'Jesus Himself was the kingdom of God'; this is so in two senses: first, because His was a life—body, soul, and spirit—entirely ruled and suffused by God; secondly, because the rule or power of God was not only inherent in, but issuing from, Him, as an active force. He was its incarnation, as we speak of a person being 'kindness incarnate' or 'justice incarnate.' As an illustration of the kingdom of God as a 'vital principle' affecting an environment, and by means of a *suitable* environment being productive of good, we may remember Jesus'

explanation of the seed corn as 'the word of the kingdom.'[1] This parable, of course, is a complete answer to those who discount the importance of the nature of the environment—personal and social as well as material. Towards the formation of a suitable environment legislation and organization may do far more than some people allow. It is here that the right organization of society is so infinitely important. But without the vital principle, it is not, and it never can produce, the kingdom of God.

Between the conditions under which our Lord taught and certain present tendencies, there is an instructive parallel. In our Lord's time the Jews may be said to have been trusting to two things: first, to a literal obedience to a very highly complex system of law, punctilious obedience to which was righteousness; secondly, to an external intervention by God from heaven, an altogether supernatural one, by which He would establish 'the kingdom of God' in a very material form. Now Jesus certainly did not despise the Law, and most certainly not that part of it which was of Divine inspiration and apart from human accretions; at the same time, as surely as St. Paul (who also did not despise it),[2] He saw its powerlessness in itself.[3] No wise man to-day despises useful legislation or social organization; on the contrary, he will promote both to the utmost of his capacity. But he will recognize the inefficacy of both law and organization *in themselves*, apart from the power of God in the hearts of men; which power alone can conquer sin—

[1] St. Matt. xiii. 19.

[2] Rom. vii. 12. *ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος.*

[3] *τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου.* (If only those who would make people perfect by Act of Parliament would remember these words.)

the opposing and destructive power—that is constantly wrecking numberless efforts after the improvement of society.

Secondly, no wise man to-day will hope for the establishment of 'the ideal social state' by external intervention, whether Divine or human.[1] The ideal social state demands, as the earlier Hebrew prophets so plainly stated, a *moral reformation*,[2] a change of character in the individual—it demands the conquest of sin, by the power of God, graciously given by God, 'liberated' through the self-sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is the forgetfulness of this truth almost more than anything else which is hindering our progress towards 'the ideal social state.'

Addendum: In St. Matt. vi. 33 we have ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ. In St. Luke xii. 31 we have simply ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ. From this comparison may we not say that 'His righteousness' is here synonymous with 'His kingdom'—*i.e.* that the καὶ in St. Matthew is epexegetic and means 'even'? Also, may we not say that 'righteousness' here, as in Rom. i. 17, 'is righteousness active and energizing, the righteousness of the Divine Will, as it were, projected and enclosing and gathering into itself human wills.'[3] This 'active righteousness,' I believe, is in a true sense 'the kingdom of God': it is the rule and the power of God in human character expressed in human conduct.

[1] See Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels*, pp. 65 ff.
[2] The message, *e.g.* of Isaiah i.
[3] Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 25.

LECTURE IV

LECTURE IV

POSSIBILITIES OF REFORM

But living the truth in love, we may grow up into Him in all things Who is the Head, even Christ, from Whom the whole body, fitly framed together and compacted through every joint of its supply, according to the effectual working of the service rendered in due measure by every part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up thereof in love (Eph. iv. 15, 16).

I

It will be well for me to commence this final lecture by taking a rapid survey of the ground we have so far traversed. My chief object in the first lecture was to help you to see how various social relationships are at the present time in numberless instances actually being discharged. To try to see things as nearly as possible as they are is, as I have already said, with the wise man the first step in all efforts for reform. He would also know the nature and the strength of the various factors, and especially the various forces for good and evil, which are entering into the problem he

wishes to solve. The wise man deals with what actually exists. To attempt to reform imaginary[1] conditions is sheer folly. Yet from want of patient investigation many[2] are actually attempting this task at the present time.

The social relationships to which I gave the first place and upon which I laid the chief stress were those of the family or the home. I showed that for several reasons these are of primary importance. Here is one reason: Relationships are certainly instrumental in the building of character, for relationships are among the most important channels of assimilation; and their strength is the measure of the degree of assimilation. Also, we must remember that the capacities for assimilation are certainly strongest and most active in childhood,[3] the special period of home life. During that period, at any rate, the direction of the development of character is usually determined. But we saw that there is extremely strong evidence to show that at present, partly from the tastes of parents, partly

[1] The so-called 'economic man' of the earlier political economists has, I think, been fully proved to have been largely a creature of the imagination.

[2] *e.g.* that class of social reformers who know only books (even Blue Books) and who do not know at first hand the actual home life of the poor.

[3] Scientific educationists are more and more realizing that the important questions in regard to the education of a child are (1) what *can* he, (2) what should he, assimilate? and (3) what is he actually assimilating?

from their circumstances, the home relationships, in a very large proportion of cases, are far from what they should be.

I passed on to consider the relationships between employers and employed. I treated these somewhat more briefly because they have recently been fully dealt with elsewhere.[1] Other important relationships which claimed our attention were, that between those called to be religious leaders and teachers and their people; that between the citizen and the State; and lastly, that between nation and nation. In each case I showed that wrong relationships were largely due to two causes: first, a neglect or an unwillingness to take sufficiently into consideration the highest capacities and the deepest needs of human nature; and secondly (and this cause is closely related to the preceding), a neglect to make the first things first.

In my second lecture I turned to the Old Testament, and I proved how large a proportion of its contents—allegorical, historical, hortatory, and didactic—was concerned with teaching upon the ideal, and rebuke of the actual, discharge of the various social relationships. We might, indeed, go so far as to say, that if we removed from the

[1] *e.g.* in Peile's *The Reproach of the Gospel*, especially Lecture iv.: see also Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, chap. iv.

Old Testament all that directly or indirectly is concerned with these, we should have a mere fragment of its contents left.

From the Old Testament I passed, in the third lecture, to the New. What we found to be true of the Old Testament we found to be, if possible, still more true of the New Testament; indeed, if we were to remove from the teaching of Jesus all that explicitly or implicitly bears upon the relationships between people in various capacities, we should have hardly anything remaining.[1] In His teaching we also found how wise the proportions are. The family stands in the first place, and in the family the marriage tie. Upon no other subject did we find His teaching so explicit and so full. It is hardly less so upon the responsibility of stewardship and for helpfulness[2]—the principles which should govern the conduct of both employers and employed. A practical recognition of the responsibilities of stewardship, and a determination to be as really helpful as possible, so Christ constantly teaches us, will alone satisfy the conditions of the relationship which must exist between each and every other member of the ideal society whose establishment is

[1] The comprehensive test of right relationship in the ideal society seems to be given in St. John xiii. 35, 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.' Cp. 1 John iii. 14.

[2] St. Matt. xx. 28 is, again, infinitely comprehensive.

the chief object of the coming of the Kingdom of God. What is true of Jesus is equally true of the Apostles; their teaching is but the application of His principles[1] to the particular circumstances in which they found their work to lie.

So far, therefore, as the teaching of Christianity is concerned—using the term Christianity in its largest sense, as implying the principles of life which have governed, or perhaps rather the spirit which has animated, the greatest religious teachers and leaders both of the Bible and the Church from Abraham onwards—there can be no doubt that Christianity teaches us that the highest moralization of all social relationships is absolutely essential to the true welfare of society; and that only through this moralization can the ideal society be realized. For the abolition of all evil social conditions, and for the establishment, in their place, of good conditions, this has always been the remedy which the greatest religious teachers have prescribed.

Briefly, then, we have before us, first, overwhelming evidence of a widespread unsatisfactory conception, and consequently an equally unsatisfactory discharge, of the social relationships; secondly, a long and continuous body of teaching which declares that only in the moralizing or rather

[1] *e.g.* 2 Cor. iv. 5, 'your servants for Jesus' sake,' the apostolic application of St. Matt. xx. 28.

Christianizing of these relationships lies the way of both individual and social salvation.

But here an objection may be raised, viz. that in the earlier and later Middle Ages, in the so-called 'ages of faith,' when the Church had practically no rival as a moral or spiritual teacher in Europe, the discharge of these relationships was eminently unsatisfactory; secondly, that in spite of all the Christian teaching being given, and all the Christian work being done to-day, the discharge of some of these relationships seems actually to be growing worse and worse; and also, that owing to the actual conditions and also to the results of both family and commercial life, as these are visible to-day, not a few earnest men and women, who profess to have at heart the welfare of society, are seeking substitutes for Christianity, are indeed urging social experiments which Christianity undoubtedly condemns.

For the so-called failure[1] of Christianity, both in the Middle Ages and at the present time, a single and sufficient reason may be given: Christianity was not then, it is not now, given a fair trial. What things were then, what things are now, done in its name! Was Western Europe in the days of Dante or of Savonarola, are Europe and America now, Christian? This, however, we must

[1] Note A.

admit, that the men and women of the Middle Ages had for their failure a far better excuse than we have. Then openly and confessedly both the life of the home and life in the world were regarded as furnishing and exhibiting a lower grade of Christianity than the life of the cloister. For this teaching also excuses may be found. Law and order were not then what they are to-day. An imperfect form of Christianity, inspired by a very imperfect knowledge of the New Testament, was widely preached. These excuses are no longer valid. Life stands in little danger from physical violence, and our knowledge of the New Testament, and so of the meaning and demands of Christianity, is far greater than it was five hundred years ago. Yet with all these we must admit that Christianity is not even now being fairly tried. By an immense majority of its nominal adherents it is simply professed without being practised.[1] It requires no exceptional knowledge of English family, or commercial, or civic life to find ample proofs of this. In my first lecture I showed that in many of the homes of the wealthy there reigns a selfish individualism whose chief aim is pleasure, and one of whose principal objects is to shirk restraint of any kind, especially such restraint as must be imposed

[1] Of all the hindrances to the progress of Christianity to-day this is by far the greatest.

by bearing natural burdens and discharging natural responsibilities. Among the very poor I showed that a true family life is, from economic causes alone, practically impossible. Put quite briefly the present condition is this: the State ought to have sufficient and healthy children; many among the rich will neither rear nor educate them, very many among the very poor cannot; therefore, says the so-called 'scientific' socialist, the State must take up the task. But this demand, like so many others made by the extreme socialists, omits one all-important factor in the problem—the nature of human nature itself. Upon this rock, if upon no other, I believe, the projects of this so-called 'scientific' socialism must be inevitably wrecked. Such words as 'fatherhood' and 'motherhood' would have no meaning. Such words as 'brother' and 'sister,' in their natural, as opposed to their metaphorical, sense, must, I suppose, cease to be used. The answer to this will be that *all* will be brothers and sisters. But what fraternity and brotherhood have connoted during the last hundred and twenty years does not make us altogether hopeful.[1] Where, if in a somewhat different sense to that of the apostle, we might ask, is to be learnt that 'love of the brethren' which in the world is

[1] Note B.

to find expression in love towards all?[1] Much as we may hope from a diffused knowledge of Eugenics[2]—and I believe that in the future we may hope very much from this—most of us, I suppose, would admit that even universal physical perfection might be purchased at too high a price.[3]

Are we prepared to sacrifice all that home means, and especially its invaluable, and to a great extent voluntarily imposed, self-discipline? What is the verdict of practically all the most experienced intelligent workers among the poor? Cherish, build up, fortify, maintain, improve the home at all costs; and if a child has not a home, our first duty is to find one for him.[4]

Now I would return for a moment to this deeper problem, one to which I have more than once alluded: Is marriage, are children, is the home, are the relationships of employer and employed, of the citizen to the State—are any of the essential or fundamental relationships of life a matter of utility only? Is their utility the only and the all-sufficient

[1] 2 Pet. i. 8, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην. See chap. viii. of Bishop Westcott's *Steps in the Christian Life*.

[2] Note C.

[3] If the material or physical aspect of life were regarded as the *most* important.

[4] Experienced Poor Law reformers feel more and more that, *properly chosen* and *under careful surveillance*, the system of 'Scattered Homes' is the best for the children for whom the Guardians are responsible; it is the most *natural* system.

standard by which they are to be judged? I quite admit that this is one and a very important standard. 'The Son of Man came to minister'; He came to be infinitely useful. There is no religion really so useful as Christianity, but it is so just because it is Divinely ordered, because it is ordered by the Infinite Wisdom, and therefore is perfectly adapted to human nature and human needs.[1] This human nature and these human relationships have a Divine origin, a Divine archetype, and for the fulfilment of this human nature and of these human relationships there is needed an equally Divine power which is of the nature of an inspiration and perpetual sanctification—that power is Christianity.

It was not by accident, but through the infinite wisdom of God's Holy Spirit, that the first picture of human nature in the Bible should be thus described: 'God created man in His own image . . . male and female created He them.'[2] It was not by accident that the last picture in the Bible should be that of the ideal society, and that it should be described as 'the holy city . . . coming down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride adorned for her husband.'[3] Thus the earliest picture in the Bible is that of the unit of society, the last is that of society in its most complete and highly

[1] This is one of the strongest grounds of Christian 'apologetic.'
[2] Gen. i. 27. [3] Rev. xxi. 2.

developed form. What I would, above all, have you notice in the first picture is the words 'in His own image,' and in the last the words 'coming down out of heaven from God.'[1] Thus both the family and the city have a Divine origin and a Divine archetype. In the first picture 'man,' and so 'the image of God,' includes 'male and female.' Either is unthinkable without the other. Hence we may assume that if this conjunction of man and woman has a Divine archetype, so must also the relationship between them have. The same may be said of the city. Why should we be told that it 'is coming down out of heaven' unless its origin, and unless the process of its manufacture,[2] is in heaven? If this is so, may we not assert that the pattern of the ideal city or commonwealth exists in the Divine Mind? Towards this pattern it must be our task to make all earthly commonwealths become similar, towards its laws all systems of legislation should approach.

Between these, the earliest and latest societies,[3] lie the contents of the Bible. May we not say that by far the greater part of these contents have to do

[1] ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ = therefore with a Divine mission. To-day the civil community, no less than the Church, has, if it would realize it, a 'mission.'

[2] Heb. xi. 10. 'τεχνίτης refers to the plan, δημιουργὸς to the execution of it' (Westcott).

[3] Note D.

with the realization of the ideal society, and so with the realization of the ideals of the various social relationships which are its essence? May we not also assert that the conditions upon which the welfare of the actual, and the realization of the ideal city, however much they may develop,[1] and however much they may differ in mode of expression, are throughout essentially the same? Abraham looked for 'the city that hath *the* foundations'—whose foundations are Divinely laid; thus for that city there can be—seeing Who is its Designer and Maker—but one code of fundamental principles of constitution possible. If we trace the story of the covenant people from the deliverance from Egypt and the wanderings in the desert, we find it is the story of the call and education of a society, no longer a family or a tribe, but a nation in the making, and the Law is at once a Divine covenant and *the* social covenant of this people. When we come to the prophets, or to those historical books which were written under their influence, we are throughout conscious of this twofold idea: first, that God has made a covenant with this people, and secondly, that a very chief part of this covenant is a social code, imposed by Him upon them. Consequently, we find that upon their obedience to this social code,

[1] 'The best possible for one moment is only the condition of a better possible for the next' (Fairbairn).

as well as upon their obedience to Him, does their welfare depend.[1] The object of His will and of that social code are the same, namely, righteousness. The conception of righteousness may develop; side by side in books which are composite documents we may find higher and lower conceptions of both God and righteousness, but throughout the Old Testament there is an underlying conviction that righteousness is the essential quality of God;[2] and therefore that this is the quality both of His covenant with the people and of the social code which He has framed for them.[3] The subject of Messianic prophecy is a difficult one and, at any rate in its implicit form, it is impossible to confine it to any particular class of Old Testament writings, especially if we interpret the term 'Messianic' (as, I believe, we should also interpret the term 'Christian') by the word 'ideal.'[4] The danger in studying Messianism is the tendency to fix our attention on the Messianic ruler or king and to forget the Messianic people; for a king implies subjects, at least *de jure*

[1] We cannot actually separate the two; love to either God or man involves love to the other; for instances of close conjunction see Deut. x. 12 ff., especially verses 18–20.

[2] This becomes explicit in the prophets.

[3] In Jer. xxiii. 6 the ideal king (Jehovah's viceroy) and in Jer. xxxiii. 16 the ideal city (community) receive the name (Jehovah is our righteousness) symbolizing their character.

[4] See my *Social Teaching of St. Paul*, chap. ii. pp. 33 ff.; also chap. vi. pp. 77 ff.

if not *de facto*.[1] One point in this study needs very careful attention, namely how, at any rate by the earlier and greater prophets, a moral reformation, only another term for a reformation in the social relationships of the people, is regarded as an essential preliminary step towards, or condition of, the establishment of the Messianic reign, that is of the ideal society.[2] With the successive subjugations of the Jews to the empires of Persia, Greece, and Rome, and the increased fading away of any hope of national independence through their own exertions, even the religious teachers began to look more and more to an external and miraculous, that is to a directly Divine intervention—*the Deus ex machinâ* of apocalypse—rather than to the effects of any internal moral reformation.[3] The lesson suggested by the thought of Israel as 'the Servant of the Lord' seems to have fallen to a large extent upon deaf ears. They would not work out their own salvation by realizing their call to be a missionary nation to the world; they could not realize that God would work in them and through them as well as for them.[4]

[1] 'In the Old Testament the Messiah is the concentration of the people; in the New the people are the extension of the Messiah' (Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 343).

[2] 'There was a great deal of idealism in all the Messianic prophecies . . . but it is chiefly a moral idealism that characterizes the representations' (*Ibid.* p. 312).

[3] The book of Daniel is the Old Testament example of this.

[4] 'Israel did not realize that its "election" was not to salvation but to service' (G. A. Smith).

There is an instructive present parallel to all this, namely in the widespread tendency to-day to trust in legislation alone as the panacea for all social evils. The more good legislation, and the more strict and efficient administration of such, the better; but the records of history are full of the futility of trusting to external help alone. Society is so far like an organism that it may be protected in a measure from without, but it can only be purified, nourished, and vitally strengthened from within.[1]

It was during the period when this tendency to forget the moral requirements for national welfare was widely prevalent [2] that John the Baptist came with his message of the need for moral and social reformation. The religious teachers of the time looked, as surely as John did, for a Kingdom of Heaven,[3] only to John the possibility of its realization was very much nearer than it was to them; and to him, as to the Old Testament prophets, the hope of its establishment was dependent upon a moral change in the people themselves. His social

[1] See p. 51.

[2] The frequent rebellions at this period were probably not unconnected with the many Apocalypses then issued. Cp. the inspiration to the Maccabaean struggle furnished by the book of Daniel.

[3] It may be questioned whether 'The Kingdom of God' meant quite the same to John as it did to our Lord. See Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, p. 52; also Reynolds, *John the Baptist*, p. 241.

mission had been foretold before his birth;[1] but with him, preparatory to the establishment of the Divine rule, lies his task of renewing the broken covenant, 'in turning the hearts' of the people to God Who demands righteousness.[2] The life of the ascetic and hermit may seem a strange preparation for one whose teaching is to have a social end. But here, again, we have a message for the present time. How many of our unsocial sins have their origin in the inability to 'travel light'! The teaching of the Baptist has not of recent years received the attention it deserves;[3] this is much to be regretted, because it seems to go to the very heart of many of the evils from which we are suffering. His fearlessness, his extremely high standard of moral demand, and his pointed efforts to deal with the special temptations of various classes within the community should all be remembered by the religious teacher of to-day. Then John, who had come from a home full of the sanctities of religion,[4] was not only a champion of the purity of home life—he died on its behalf. In his Οὐκ ἔξεστιν ('it is not lawful')[5] there is much more than an appeal to the law of the land, although that law had a Divine origin. There is an appeal to the essentially binding nature

[1] St. Luke i. 14 ff.
[2] St. Luke i. 16.
[3] Reynolds, *John the Baptist*, p. v.
[4] St. Luke i. 6.
[5] St. Mark vi. 18.

of the everlasting sanctities. In his exhortation to those who had more than enough [1] to deal liberally with those who had less than sufficient, he strikes at the root of many a social evil; he appeals for the practical realization of true social relationship. As examples of the intensely practical character of John's teaching, take his charges to the *publicani* and the soldiers.[2] The tax-collector in those days was, and the soldier on active service always is, tempted to commit oppression—an unsocial sin. Neither the profession of the tax-gatherer nor of the soldier in itself is necessarily unsocial; both indeed may be regarded as essential, the one being part of the alimentary system of the commonwealth, the other as needful for its defence. John's demand for righteousness was an echo of that of the Old Testament in regard to the social ideal; he revived the noblest and purest traditions of Messianic prophecy, for he revived the need of the moralizing of the social relationships as essential to the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom.

Following immediately upon John's preaching came our Lord with identically the same proclamation—'the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.' But even more clearly than John He stated the moral conditions essential for its realization in the hearts

[1] St. Luke iii. 11. [2] St. Luke iii. 12–14.

and lives of men.[1] Immediately upon its first proclamation follows the first call of the first disciples, the nucleus of the reformed society whose task shall be to call others in.[2] This accomplished, the law (in the widest sense of the term) of the new society is proclaimed.[3] The first requisite for citizenship is the cultivation of the spirit of humility and the abolition of the unsocial spirit of pride;[4] the second is readiness to suffer on behalf of what is moral,[5] *i.e.* for justice—the most fundamental and most comprehensive of all social virtues. Our Lord also teaches that greatness in the Kingdom will depend upon respect for, and inculcation of, the law[6]—the social code between citizens.[7] The prayer of the citizens—and prayer means aspiration, implying effort—is to be for the realization of the Kingdom.[8] Men are everywhere seeking for satisfaction,[9] but the primary object of search for the disciple of Christ must be 'the Kingdom,' and by

[1] St. Matt. iv. 17 (Μετανοεῖτε); cp. chap. v. 3 (The 'poor in spirit' are those who submit themselves to God's will), and also verse 10.

[2] St. Matt. iv. 18, 19.

[3] St. Matt. v–vii—The Sermon on the Mount.

[4] St. Matt. v. 3. [5] St. Matt. v. 10.

[6] The Divine power—a 'spiritual-moral' force, working upon and through man—works, like the forces of nature, according to Divinely ordained laws. Upon the spiritual and the moral see Romanes, *Thoughts on Religion*, p. 143; the combination spiritual-moral is the highest conceivable.

[7] St. Matt. v. 19.

[8] The Lord's Prayer, St. Matt. vi. 9 ff.

[9] St. Matt. vi. 25 ff.

St. Matthew the word 'righteousness' is appended to 'Kingdom' as probably indicating its most comprehensive quality, indeed as being practically a synonym for it. Again and again the announcement of the Kingdom, the power which is to establish the ideal social state, is coupled with descriptions of works of mercy, and with injunctions to philanthropic activity. Only the citizens of the Kingdom, those who live in allegiance to its King and whose lives are governed and inspired by the Divine power, can enter into its secrets.[1] Once more, the Kingdom of Heaven is like leaven,[2] like that which, by a living force and process, binds all its citizens into a unity—unites into a compact mass the innumerable separate particles which are comparatively useless until the union into a social whole has taken place. So we might proceed through the whole of the hundred and fifty instances of the mention of the 'Kingdom' in the Gospels. Everywhere the significance is social as well as personal, though this does not prevent its being also eschatological. Everywhere we have implied the existence of some social principle and the action of some social force, though mediated through the sanctified individual life: everywhere the origin of both principle and power is implied to be Divine: everywhere the realization of the life of the Kingdom

[1] St. Matt. xiii. 11. [2] St. Matt. xiii. 33.

depends upon the possession of moral (which are also social) qualities and the observance of moral (which are also social[1]) laws.[2]

When we pass from the Gospels to the rest of the New Testament a society has been formed among whose objects is the realization of the Ideal Society, the *Ecclesia*, which is the Divinely appointed instrument for the practical recognition of the Divine authority in the world. From the first the objects of this society are definitely moral and social. Repentance, the first condition of membership, and 'the saving of themselves' of the members from a 'crooked' generation are moral means;[3] the early communism of goods is a mark of strong sociality;[4] and the first internal difficulty of the society was connected with almsgiving, a social work.[5] The transformation of Saul the persecutor (an immoral and unsocial calling) into Paul the preacher of the Divine righteousness, the founder of communities, and the man who risked his life in order to fulfil a philanthropic mission,[6] is surely the transition from the immoral (for cruelty is always immoral) to the

[1] The 'moralizing' and 'socializing' of people may be regarded as different terms for the same process.

[2] Upon the significance of the 'Kingdom of God' (or 'of Heaven') see Additional Note to Lecture III.

[3] Acts ii. 38, μετανοήσατε; verse 40, σκολιᾶς (in 1 Pet. ii. 18 opposed to ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐπιεικής).

[4] Acts ii. 44.

[5] Acts vi. 1 ff.

[6] Acts xxiv. 17.

moral, and from the unsocial to the social. St. Paul's supreme and most comprehensive synonym for 'Christianity'—for Christianity is at once the subject and object of the revelation of the Gospel—is that it is the 'righteousness of God out of faith unto faith,'[1] the highest moral life issuing from trust (one of the greatest moral virtues) unto the establishment of the same virtue.

In the greatest of all St. Paul's descriptions of the nature of the society called to establish the Kingdom,[2] two truths stand out: first, its high moral ideals both of conduct and purpose, made especially vivid from the want of these among those in the midst of whom it must pursue its task; secondly, the immense importance attached to the social bonds and connections.[3] The passage opens by strongly inculcating three virtues, each of which is both Christlike and social—humility, meekness, and 'long-temper,'[4] in opposition to the three unsocial sins of pride, self-assertion, and irascibility. The society is to be an enlarged family; it has a common Father;[5] it is therefore a brotherhood; the One Father's life and the Eldest Brother's nature

[1] Rom. i. 17: 'The phrase means "starting from a smaller quantity of faith to produce a larger quantity," at once intensively and extensively, in the individual and in society' (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans, in loc.*).

[2] Eph. iv. 1 ff.

[3] Eph. iv. 16.

[4] Eph. iv. 2, note *μακροθυμίας.*

[5] iv. 6, *ἷς . . . πατὴρ πάντων.*

are to be in all. It is not only a family, it is a body; it is regarded as a single organism whose different members (all made energetic[1] through the one life) have each a different function to perform—one which is essential to the welfare of the body. The body has a Head, the source of all life and movement;[2] each member must be absolutely faithful in the twofold sense of the word,[3] and this faithfulness springs from love, acts in a medium of love, and expresses itself in deeds of love. While the Head is the source of all vital energy,[4] the supply of this energy to each part depends upon the connections,[5] not only of the Head with each member, but between the members themselves; in other words, upon the relationships between the parts. The vital energy is 'ministered through every contact of the supply';[5] as it is put quite clearly by Bishop Westcott, 'Wherever one part comes into close connection with another part it communicates that which it has to give,'[6] and this, at least in part, is surely proportional to what it has received. What is every one of these 'junctures and ligaments'[7] but a social relationship sanctified to a Divine purpose,

[1] Eph. iv. 16, *κατ' ἐνέργειαν.* [2] Eph. iv. 15.

[3] *i.e.* as trustworthy and trusting.

[4] Eph. iv. 16, *ἐξ οὗ.*

[5] Eph. iv. 16, *διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας.*

[6] Westcott, *Ephesians, in loc.*

[7] Col. ii. 19. Bishop Lightfoot's rendering of *διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων.*

upon the moral[1] condition of which the health of the whole body and the usefulness of every member depends? Think of all the various connections in the human body—sensory nerves and motor nerves, muscles and tendons, the alimentary system, the respiratory system, the circulation of the blood! What a diversity, yet a unity! We speak of these various systems as if they were independent, but actually they are all intimately inter-related and mutually dependent upon each other. If one is out of health, it means that all the others are feeling the loss. We know that if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it;[2] and that this is so because of the intimate nature of these connections. Thus if one connection, one relationship, is wrong, so will it be with every other.

From this ideal, whose realization is to be the first object[3] of the Christian society, that is of society Christianized with a view to the realization of the Kingdom, St. Paul turns[4] to contemplate the actual relationships of society, as he saw these in the cities of Asia. The first mark of this heathen society was absence of purpose, and therefore failure of any true purpose.[5] Were there not then, as now, in the lives

[1] Because in close communion with Christ the Head, and sanctified by His life.

[2] 1 Cor. xii. 26.

[3] Eph. iv. 3, *σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἑνότητα.*

[4] In Eph. iv. 17 ff.

[5] Armitage Robinson on *ματαιότητι* in verse 17.

of most people a multitude of individual purposes without reference to the one purpose—the realization of the Kingdom — which should co-ordinate all purposes? Where all action should receive guidance there was no illumination;[1] there was no practical recognition of a Divine end inspiring and directing each separate action. There was also moral insensibility.[2] Is not such widespread to-day? There was also culpable ignorance[3] issuing in want of feeling. Is not our culpable ignorance of the manner in which thousands to-day exist the cause of our want of feeling for their unhappy condition?[4] This want of feeling again issued in atrophy of conscience[5] expressed in devotion to moral wantonness,[6] the whole being the product of that selfishness[7] which causes men to sacrifice others to their own appetites. Are parallels, possibly closer than we care to contemplate, unknown among ourselves to-day? Here is life lived as St. Paul saw it then, and as we, if we will open our eyes, may see it lived now.

[1] Verse 18, *ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες*; cp. St. Matt. vi. 23, and contr. Eph. i. 18.

[2] Verse 18, *διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας*.

[3] *ἄγνοια* in verse 18; on the word in 1 Pet. 14 Hort writes, 'Here there is no force in a reference to pardonable misconduct.'

[4] With all the recent greater diffusion of what is termed knowledge of social conditions it is still true that one half of the world has no idea of how the other half exists.

[5] *ἀπηλγηκότες* in verse 19.

[6] *ἀσέλγεια*, which shocks the sense of public decency.

[7] The root cause of all unsocial sins.

St. Paul at once turns[1] to the contrast of Christian social life as it should be lived in the Christian, the ideal society. His language demands very careful attention. 'But ye did not so learn *the*[2] Christ . . . as there is truth in Jesus.' He has only a few lines before drawn attention to 'the body whose Head is in heaven, and whose limbs are on earth,' that body whose presence and activities represent the Head; into which body the Christian has been incorporated, into the life and movement and customs of which he has been trained. Is not this the body he means by 'the Christ,' and is not its 'Head' Jesus? Is not 'the Christ' the 'extension' of Jesus?[3] Is not the life of this body to be the expression of the truth in Jesus?[4] Were not those virtues which are to be characteristic of the Messianic (the Christ) society (the ideal society) exactly the virtues revealed in the life, in the conduct, of the historic Jesus, and is it not just these virtues which are 'eternal and substantial amid the fleeting forms of earthly phenomena'?

Having once more pictured the ideal, St. Paul,

[1] In verse 20.

[2] *τὸν χριστόν*, contrast the anarthrous *Χριστός* in verse 15.

[3] See the chapter on 'The "Christ" of St. Paul,' in my *Social Teaching of St. Paul*, pp. 77 ff.

[4] 'The humanity of Christ (*Jesus*) gives reality to our limited conceptions. Truth is no convention. . . . The Messiah was revealed in Jesus in terms, so to speak, of human experience' (Westcott *in loc.*).

as before, returns immediately to the actual,[1] to the want of the moral in the social relationships as he saw these all around him. The very first of these immoralities is want of truthfulness, and this endangers the whole social life.[2] It is a sign of want of health when the eye deceives the hand, or the foot deceives the eye. Another unsocial sin is continued ill-feeling or resentment,[3] and yet another is dishonesty, instead of which there should be honest labour which enables a man to impart to those in need. But what would St. Paul have said to those who were compulsorily idle through no fault of their own? This condemnation of stealing[4] must include a condemnation of that form of dishonesty which consists in taking without just payment the labour of others to supply our wishes.[5] What would St. Paul have said to sweated industry? Yet another form of unsocial sin is the use of corrupt speech, and speech is the great medium of social intercourse; it is also that which

[1] In verse 22. Bishop Westcott points out that in verses 22–24 we have 'three processes, (1) the putting off "the old man," (2) the renewal of spiritual power, (3) the putting on the "new man."'

[2] The idea of truth forms the transition to the new section which commences with verse 25. Untruthfulness, in all its various forms, is an unsocial sin whose effects we cannot estimate. See Additional Note, p. 340.

[3] 1 Cor. xiii. 5 (*b*). [4] Eph. iv. 28.

[5] Instead of by our own labour ministering to the needs of others. 'The inspiration of labour is not personal gain, but fulness of service' (Westcott).

should especially convey inspiring ideas. What can the health of the body be, what can the relationship of the various members be, if through the veins there courses such a poison? What a condemnation of the foul and filthy and disease-carrying literature that floods us at the present time, especially such as circulates among the young, among school boys and school girls![1] Bitterness[2] is yet another unsocial sin. How can the social relationships be sound when the relation of party to party or of class to class is expressed in language and conduct which reveal the cherishing of resentful feelings?[3] What would St. Paul have said to an inflammatory 'yellow' press?

Notice how St. Paul sums up all this teaching in one pregnant exhortation: 'Be ye therefore imitators of God,'[4] as those who share His nature,

[1] Only those who have investigated this special evil have any idea of its extent at the present time. At the International Congress of School Hygiene, in 1907, Mr. J. L. Paton, headmaster of the Manchester Grammar School, said, 'There are at least five different cheap periodicals regularly displayed and sold on the railway bookstalls, some of them associated in past times with names of good repute, periodicals which are now rank poison to the boyhood and girlhood of this country.' *σαπρός* has a wide range of meaning, from 'rotten' or 'corrupt' to 'effete,' 'idle,' 'worthless.' Speech to which any of these adjectives can be applied is condemned.

[2] *πικρία*: 'an embittered and resentful spirit which refuses reconciliation.'

[3] Have we not of recent years witnessed a much-to-be-deplored growth of bitterness of both party-feeling and party-language?

[4] Eph. v. 1.

and who are conscious of a love which is the essence of the Divine nature; and walk in a love so defined, one supremely manifested for us in the life of the historic Christ, a life whose essential marks were the devotion of the self-sacrifice of life. Thus once more St. Paul returns to the Divine source of human life and the Divine archetypes of human relationships; and it seems, so far as the Bible is concerned, as if these two exhortations, first, see that your conduct proceeds from a Divine source, that is, see that it has a Divine inspiration; and, secondly, see that it conforms to a Divine archetype, that is to all that God revealed in Christ implies—it seems as if in these two exhortations is comprised all that can be said.

II

In the place of this absolutely clear teaching of Holy Scripture, indeed sometimes in direct opposition to it, what do we find in much of the ethical and social teaching of to-day? What do we find both in theory and in practice? Let us take one example of what we actually do find. We find many works upon what are termed 'naturalistic' ethics. I quite recognize that the term needs to be interpreted and criticized with special care, as do also the terms 'development' and 'evolution.' It

is possible, I suppose, to give the term 'naturalistic,' as applied to the ethical, an interpretation with which the Christian *need* not necessarily disagree, any more than he need disagree with the term 'utilitarian.' 'Naturalistic' may point simply to a process, as 'utilitarian' may point simply to an object. But these are not the usual significations of the words. 'Naturalistic' is generally regarded as opposed to both spiritual and revealed. Utilitarian implies at least a reference to the process by which the utility has been proved. Even the distinction between the terms 'nominalistic' and 'realistic' in the mediæval sense, viz. as that of those who regarded *universalia post aut ante rem*,[1] is not sufficient to condemn entirely the one in favour of the other. There were Christians in both schools, as there were men in both whose lives it was a little difficult to connect with an honest faith in Christ. The question may be one of the *method* as well as of the *fact* of revelation, of the way in which the Creator and Ruler of the Universe manifests His will, and not one wholly of His existence. What, I believe, the man who honestly accepts the New Testament is committed to is that what such terms as righteousness, justice, truth, purity, and love describe, and what such relationships as those of the family, of employer and

[1] Trench, *Mediæval Church History*, pp. 269 ff.

employed, and of the citizen and the State imply, have prototypes in perfection in the Divine Nature Itself; that when we seek after righteousness, or seek after the perfect discharge of these relationships, we are not trying only to improve that which already exists on earth, but to approach a perfection which already and just as surely exists in 'heaven.' The struggle involved in either case—I mean either to rise above the actual best, or to rise towards an absolute perfect—may imply faith in man; whereas in the second case it must imply faith in God as well as faith in man;[1] but its faith in man will then be faith in man redeemed by Christ and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. In brief, it must imply a spiritual philosophy of the universe, and therefore a spiritual philosophy of human life and of society.

As we look back over the last hundred years the greatest changes which have taken place, both in social life and in 'our ways of thinking,' have been chiefly due to our enormously increased knowledge of physical science.[2] If we look back over a

[1] As an illustration of this second point of view take the following sentence, 'Religion, as Education, begins with faith in the capacity of man to respond to the spirit of truth, and proceeds, like education, through faith in the revelation of truth' (Peabody, *The Religion of an Educated Man*, p. 33). (To Christians Jesus Christ is 'the Truth.')

[2] *e.g.* to the enormously enlarged application of such a term as 'evolution.'

much shorter period we see knowledge also rapidly increasing in another, and to some extent an allied, sphere, yet one very difficult either to define or to limit. The term 'mental and moral science,' while unsatisfactory, may however suffice to indicate the sphere to which I refer. In this sphere methods of study analogous to those employed in regard to physical science [1] are being zealously pursued. Investigations are being widely and carefully made, not only in order to increase knowledge, but in order to utilize more successfully the forces and capacities with whose nature and modes of operation within this sphere we are gradually becoming more fully acquainted. A really scientific psychology, based, at least in part, upon a scientific knowledge of biology and of physiology, is the primary requisite here for satisfactory progress. Yet while we have learnt and are still learning much, it will, I think, be admitted, that even amongst our greatest authorities upon psychology there is hardly yet that measure of agreement which would justify us in applying to it the name of an exact science, at any rate not in the same sense in which we should employ the term in reference to, say, biology or physiology. Still, we do already know enough of psychology to make our knowledge of it extremely

[1] *e.g.* quantitative as well as qualitative analyses of psychological processes.

useful.[1] Then, issuing from a more adequate knowledge of psychology, we may hope for a more scientific study of both sociology and ethics. In each what we must above all else seek to discover is, as I have already hinted, how more surely and more usefully to apply various mental and moral, and, above all, I would add, spiritual forces and influences. Through our increased knowledge in one branch of psychology the art or practice of teaching, that is the intellectual part of education, has, within the last few years, been almost revolutionized. (I refer, of course, to the improved methods whereby knowledge is imparted and assimilated.) But education in the true sense of the word is concerned even more with the improvement and wise development of *character* than with mere increase of knowledge; though the two cannot actually be separated. Psychology will here in the near future help us far more than it does at the present time, especially what is termed the Psychology of Society, a psychology which will deal not so much with mental and moral forces and processes in the mind and character of the individual, as with mental and moral forces and processes either actually at work or capable of being set to work—first, between the minds and characters of separate individuals; secondly, between

[1] Note E.

individuals and groups of individuals; and thirdly, between such groups themselves. We shall, I believe, in the near future obtain an immense increase of knowledge in regard to all that relates to the social mind and the social character. Already we know that mind does act upon mind and character upon character; we also know how strongly the collective or social mind acts upon the individual mind, and also how the social mind is influenced by exceptional individual minds. Another way of stating these truths is to assert how assimilative the individual mind and so the individual character is of its intellectual, moral, and social environment. Now the main channels whereby this assimilation takes place have been the subject of these lectures, for they are nothing more or less than the social relationships. What I would now assert is, that the improvement towards perfection of these relationships will be even more important in the future than it has been in the past, because of our increased ability, through increased knowledge, to utilize them as the instruments or channels of mental, moral, and spiritual forces to the highest ends.[1]

[1] We must remember that all increase of knowledge carries with it a danger—viz. the misuse of this knowledge, its application to evil, instead of to beneficent, ends. The increase of education has tended to increase the proportion of crimes for which some (occasionally much) knowledge is necessary; *e.g.* fraud and

It has frequently been stated that social reformers generally may be divided into two great classes: those who lay stress upon the improvement of the individual, and those who lay stress upon his environment. Two further statements are commonly made: first, that to-day the tendency is to lay far too little stress upon the need of improving the individual, or upon getting him to improve himself, and far too much stress upon the need of improving his environment; secondly, that our Lord entirely reversed this proportion.[1] But does not Social Psychology show us, that except for a moment, if for that, it is impossible even in thought to separate an individual from his environment? Is there not a process of action and reaction between the two going on continuously? Then, is our Lord so careless about environment as He is sometimes represented to be? What of the 'leaven of the Pharisees' and of the 'leaven of Herod'?[2] What of 'Beware of the Scribes'?[3] What of this saying to St. Peter, 'I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not?'[4] What of the petitions, 'Lead us not into temptation; but

forgery in one sphere, the making of destructive explosives in another. Every opportunity is not only a responsibility for right use; it should warn against the possibility of wrong use.

[1] See my *Social Principles of the Gospel*, pp. 79 ff.

[2] St. Mark viii. 15.

[3] St. Mark xii. 38.

[4] St. Luke xxii. 32.

deliver us from evil'?[1] There is surely much about the effects of environment in the parables of the Lost Sheep[2] and the Prodigal Son.[3] On the contrary, it is the strength and the qualities of the forces which are passing to and fro along those invisible and intangible and immaterial connections which we call social relationships; it is these connections between the individual and his human environment which Jesus recognized to be of such infinite importance upon both. But there is one parable above all others which emphasizes the lessons we are daily learning, not only from the psychology of the individual, but from that of society—the parable of the Sower, which perhaps should rather be called 'the parable of the Soils.'[4] Could the author of that parable be accused of under-rating the power, or influence, or importance of environment, or of the relationships between any life and its surroundings? Is it not worth noticing in passing that two[5] of the three causes of the life-bringing message (itself an organism) failing to fulfil its purpose, as well as the one reason why it was successful, are attributed directly or indirectly to the influence of other organisms?

[1] St. Matt. vi. 13.
[2] The want of the proper environment in this case.
[3] The riotous livers and the far country.
[4] The name is due to Dr. McLaren.
[5] The birds and the thorns.

The present, we are often told, is an age of exceptionally rapid change, and certainly a study of other ages does seem to confirm this statement. But a period of rapid change must also be a period of exceptionally numerous opportunities, and therefore of correspondingly great responsibilities, if for no other reason than because the opportunities so soon pass. It is an age in which the Christian, and especially the Christian teacher, needs to be extremely on the alert. We must fight living foes. We must not be content either to fight the ghosts of the dead or to rifle the corpses of the slain. The conflict between religion and physical science is largely a conflict of the past,[1] and materialism is to a great extent a bankrupt and discredited philosophy. It does not explain or account for the facts, for the actual experiences of life. But if the ground upon which, and the foes with which, Christianity has to do battle have changed, the ground is not less dangerous nor is the conflict less real than it was. Rather are both more dangerous. The foe is less tangible and the scene of conflict is nearer to the citadel. The present conflict is one of opposite, mutually exclusive philosophies of life, and especially in regard to morals. It is often asserted, and more often insinuated or implied, that Christianity does not

[1] See Note F.

and cannot supply a sufficient guidance for conduct, as this is required in the new conditions of the present. But what are the facts? It is certainly true that discoveries in physical science have placed man in an environment widely different from that of any other period. It is also true that these discoveries have been the causes of new social and economic problems. Probably there is an unprecedented number of involuntarily unemployed to-day. Again, the number and variety of material possessions within man's reach is greater than ever, and with this increase the temptation is greater to fancy that life *does* consist in the number of our possessions. All these changes have undoubtedly brought with them new social and moral difficulties. But side by side with these we have acquired much more knowledge of the forces and capacities of human nature, of mental, moral and spiritual forces, of the laws which govern the exercise and direction of these forces, all of which, we must remember, are concerned with the development of character.[1] And these new discoveries do not contradict, but are generally in close agreement with, what the Christian regards as the teaching of Revelation, as he finds it in the loftier parts of the Old, and in the New Testament.

[1] Those who would gauge the influences of moral and spiritual forces upon character will be much helped by a study of the Psychology of Religion. See Note G.

Face to face with the conditions and movements of the present, what are the possibilities of the Church? What is the duty (in the most comprehensive sense of the word) of the Christian teacher, worker, and reformer?

More than forty years ago the late Professor Seeley published an essay on 'The Church as a Teacher of Morality.'[1] That essay deserves to be studied to-day. It is both critical and constructive; it is both denunciatory and exhortative. It states a need, and it gives reasons why the need was not then supplied; it also calls for earnest and strenuous efforts to supply it. While there are statements in the essay with which we cannot wholly agree, there is very much that we might with advantage take to heart; for some of the particular needs it pointed out are even greater to-day than when it was written. As an example of statements with which we cannot agree I would cite this: 'One of the greatest practical difficulties' [in the realization of the author's object, that the clergy should be thoroughly competent teachers of the highest morality] 'is the necessary (*sic*) incompetence of the average clergyman to that part of his work which is most important.'[2] As an explanation of this statement Professor Seeley adds: 'What is

[1] Republished in *Lectures and Essays* (1895); the references are to this edition.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 313.

difficult is to imagine how a large number of men can be found competent to treat of the deepest and most delicate subjects that can occupy the human mind, "the springs of life, the depths of awe," without degrading them.'[1] If to his words 'necessary incompetence' Professor Seeley had added, 'under the existing conditions of the education and work of the clergy,'[2] I believe his statement would be almost, if not entirely, as true to-day as it was forty years ago. I say this in all seriousness, because I believe the charge can be thoroughly substantiated. As examples of statements in the essay to which we need to pay the closest attention, take these: 'The clergy are charged with the task of applying to the wants of men, both individuals and societies, the remedy provided by certain religious and moral principles. . . . They need, therefore, to study two things—Christianity and that modern society to which Christianity is to be applied. Society is constantly shifting, it is extremely complex; and philosophy . . . has thrown much light upon the laws which govern its changes.[3] If, therefore,

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 314.

[2] What proportion of the clergy of the English Church have had any training in psychology and ethics, indeed in 'mental and moral science' generally? Further, what incentives or even opportunities have they to pursue this (or any other study) after ordination?

[3] If this was true forty years ago it is infinitely more true now: *i.e.* the amount of knowledge available in this sphere is many times greater.

a system of morality is to be built on the basis of Christian theology, as it must be if Christianity is the universal religion, it will not be sufficient for the clergy to read the New Testament and imbue themselves with its maxims. They must read with equal diligence in the book of the modern time. Their business is not merely to repeat a message; they are charged with an embassy which demands the employment of their own independent judgment and discretion.[1] They must add a philosophy to their religion, they must originate, combine, adapt. They must be not merely passive channels of ancient wisdom, passive administrators of ancient rules, but thinkers, interpreters of the age, the living legislators of a living society.'[2] Or, take the following passage, in which Professor Seeley pleads for the connection between morality and politics and social science; though he is most careful to qualify his advice by asserting that it is only 'when a Church is independent of political parties and sure of the respect of the people, when it can speak with impartiality and with authority,'[3] and when 'political religion means only the purifying of politics by connecting them with duty, honour and piety,'[4] that the Church can help to establish and strengthen this connection. The passage to which I refer is as follows: 'There

[1] Note H.
[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 307, 308.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 305.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 305.

is another subject besides theology from which morality ought not to be severed, and cannot be severed without losing most of its vitality. This is political and social science. It is common . . . to maintain that the clergy should have nothing to do with politics. Yet it is evident enough that in relinquishing politics the clergy practically renounce their influence over men, and become mere spiritual directors to women and children.[1] . . . That the clergy should not engage themselves in party conflicts is true . . . this is not because politics are out of their province, but in order that they may exercise a more elevated kind of political influence. . . . Morals cannot be severed from politics any more than the individual can be isolated from society. If the individual is profoundly modified by the character and condition of the corporate body . . . and the moral health of the whole makes itself seen in the separate parts, how is it possible for the teacher to confine himself to the individual and neglect the State?'[2]

Fifteen years ago Bishop Westcott, in an address upon 'The Christian Law,'[3] defined that law as lying in the Person and the work of Christ, and as 'the embodiment of the Truth for action in forms

[1] This statement surely requires very considerable qualification.

[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 300 f. Upon 'Religion and Politics' see p. 139.

[3] Before the Christian Social Union at Manchester in 1895. (Republished in *Christian Social Union Addresses.*)

answering to the conditions of society from age to age.'[1] In this address he proceeded to treat the 'Christian Law' for each age as an interpretation of Christ's mind in the light of that age, and he strongly pressed its claim in relation to new social and new political conditions; he also stated that 'in faith we are bound to study unweariedly how to apply the moral truths and principles of Christianity to the social and economic difficulties of the present time.'[2] The burden of the whole address is the new opportunities, and therewith the new responsibilities, which new conditions have revealed to us. Bishop Westcott pleads, as Professor Seeley had pleaded twenty-five years before, for adequate knowledge, and whose knowledge was then more adequate than his own! And his knowledge was certainly twofold—first, of Christian principles, and secondly, of the actual conditions of modern industrial life.

To-day we are, I believe, still suffering, not only from inadequate knowledge,[3] but also from a very imperfect co-ordination of the knowledge we possess. Some have a considerable knowledge of Christian truth, the result of long and deep study of the Bible; others have a wide knowledge of

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 18.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 20. I would venture to add to the words 'the moral truths and principles,' *and the moral forces* 'of Christianity,' &c.

[3] Note I.

actual conditions and actual needs gathered from long experience and careful investigation of the lives and homes of different classes of society.[1] But only rarely do we find these two kinds of knowledge in combination. Yet a knowledge of life is essential for discovering the full meaning of the deep truths of revelation ; so, just as surely, a deep insight into the real significance of these truths is necessary before they can be safely employed as inspirations and guides to action or conduct.

But in the fifteen years which have elapsed since Bishop Westcott wrote, our knowledge in another field has, as I have already stated, enormously increased. So to-day we require knowledge, not only in two fields, but in *three*. In knowledge of actual conditions we have knowledge of the needs of man and of society. In Holy Scripture we shall find ideals and promises of moral and spiritual guidance, also instruction upon the methods we must employ in order to obtain those moral and spiritual forces whereby these ideals may be realized. Lastly, from our growing knowledge of psychology, and especially of social psychology, we have already in a measure learnt, and in the near future we

[1] Possibly in the opportunities for this co-ordination of knowledge in these two fields the new universities have an advantage over the old. There are few practical problems of modern life, as these affect our own country, which cannot be studied in Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Leeds, &c.

may learn far more, how to use or apply the various forces with which our nature either is endowed, or may be endowed, to the highest and best advantage.

But knowledge, however deep and however comprehensive, is in itself insufficient. Together with knowledge must go love issuing in self-sacrifice, a self-sacrifice inspired by the purest motives and guided by the highest wisdom. And this self-sacrifice will have to be exercised in many directions, and not least in that strong self-discipline which is essential if we would gain and store up the power to control, direct, and exercise to the utmost advantage the moral and spiritual powers which we may not only acquire, but develop. Here, again, the lessons of psychology may be most useful, for psychology will teach us that self-control is largely due to acquiring the ability to fix the attention upon the highest and most worthy objects, and also to training the will to exercise itself solely upon the accomplishment of these. It is too often forgotten that self-control is essentially positive and not negative; it is the power of the right direction of the will. Bearing this in mind, it will be seen that the influence it may exert upon the moralization of the social relationships is extremely great, for these relationships are the instruments and channels through which it is exercised.[1]

[1] Note I.

The great victories in the sphere of physical nature have been won by the skilful control of physical forces, and so their adaptation to definite and desirable objects.[1] If victories are to be won in the sphere of the moral, the social, and the spiritual, they must be achieved by an analogous process—that is, by the skilful adaptation of the forces acting in, and belonging to, these spheres to purposes we would accomplish. The elements to be considered in the moral or spiritual sphere might at first sight be regarded as twofold, actually they are three: first, the capacities and powers with which our psychical nature has been endowed; secondly, those Divine forces which, by the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Mission of the Spirit, have been liberated in a far larger degree, and which have been placed at man's disposal in much richer measure. But, as I have just said, a third element exists, and this is an instrument which no believer in the Incarnation can or will neglect. I mean man's *physical* nature. In the nature of the Perfect Man there was a trinity of powers; in the nature of each man there must be the same; and for the welfare of the whole man the health and development of each member of

[1] The immense number of useful objects to which the force or power of electricity is now applied; the force can be stored and expended at will.

this trinity is essential.[1] Christianity is a religion for the whole of man. It concerns man's physical as well as his psychical and his spiritual nature. Under present conditions the health of each of these is bound up with the health of the others; therefore the welfare of man is bound up with the due supply of his physical needs. 'Physical misery tends to imbrute man,' therefore 'we believe that certain physical conditions are favourable to a generous character.'[2] If I purchase from a man his physical strength, I must see that I pay him at least what will enable him to satisfy his physical needs and maintain his physical efficiency. The relationship between us may be mental; but the mental is dependent on the physical, and therefore the relationship must also be expressible in terms of a just exchange of physical necessaries, else it is not moral. Life is sacramental, and the physical is not only a sign but the channel for the reception and possession of the spiritual. So must all our social relationships be sacramental. Each should be nothing less than a sign and a channel of Divine grace.

In these lectures there is one truth and one fact which I may be charged with having from time to time forgotten, or at least with having underrated, and that is the responsibility of the individual; and I

[1] 1 Thess. v. 23.

[2] Westcott, *Christian Social Union Addresses*, pp. 26, 27.

may be asked, Did not Christ lay the greatest stress upon this? What is the meaning of the parables of the Talents, the Pounds, the Ten Virgins, the Unmerciful Servant, even of the Good Samaritan? Is not Christianity an appeal to the Individual? And does not 'all the virtue lie in the echo'[1] awakened in the individual heart? I have not forgotten either the responsibility or the value of the individual. But here are three truths of equal importance and which must be remembered side by side: first, that society, and all that it implies, exists for the individual; secondly, that the individual simply as an individual is unthinkable; thirdly, that only in the intercourse of an organized society can the individual become what he was meant to become. Let us go as far as we can to the root of the matter. The mind, or perhaps more correctly, the character, is the man. Let each think of his own character, what it is to-day, what it was one year or ten years ago, out of what it has been formed, to what are the changes in it, for better or for worse, due. Both good and evil influences have acted upon it; it has assimilated much; it has rejected a good deal, sometimes wisely, sometimes the reverse. What have been the principal channels whereby all the various influences have acted upon it? Whereby has it obtained what it

[1] The expression is Archbishop Alexander's.

possesses? Marcus Aurelius was right. They are mainly the social influences, the influences of parent, husband, wife, and child, of employer or employed, of friend or acquaintance, of pastor or teacher or pupil; and we must not think only of the influences of individuals, but of the influences of groups of individuals among whom we have lived and worked —the influences of family and school and business and Church and State. Each and all of these have influenced and affected our character. What we are to-day is largely due to what we have assimilated from all those with whom we have had social relations of various kinds and degrees.

But the character is not only affected by what we receive, it is also affected by what we give and by what we do; and, perhaps, most of all by what we *strive* to do. The relationship between ourselves and others has not been on our part a wholly passive one. We have reacted wisely or unwisely, rightly or wrongly, to the various stimuli produced by the presence, the conversation, the needs, the conduct of others. Each reaction, and the nature and quality of it, has again affected our character. It is the whole environment, human as well as material, and especially that part of it which is communicated through the social relationships, by which the individual character is developed, by which it is made or marred.

Read any exhortation in Holy Scripture with this thought in mind, and how much more luminous and how much more practical it becomes! Take St. Paul's exhortations to Timothy (an individual) as we find these in the epistles addressed to him: 'From a babe thou hast known the Holy Scriptures.'[1] From whom had he learnt them?[2] 'Exercise thyself unto godliness'[3] For what end?[4] Rather, for the sake of whom? 'We labour,' but surely not for ourselves. 'Command and teach.' But whom? The epistles also deal with Timothy's conduct towards the elder and younger men, the elder and younger women, and the widows; they speak of the duty of a man 'providing for his own.' Christianity may be, indeed is, a gospel for the individual, but the environment for which and out of which the individual is made is never for a moment out of sight. And we can no more think of that environment without thinking of material things than could St. Paul. The widow and the family (a man's 'own') must be provided for; their material needs must be supplied, and the doing of this is as good for the one supplying as for those supplied; it is a character-making process; it is often not less than a salvation for the individual. But St. Paul assumes

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 15.

[2] The answer is in chap. ii. 5.

[3] 1 Tim. iv. 7.

[4] The answer is in verse 12: 'be thou an ensample.'

the *possibility* of doing it. Does that possibility always exist to-day? Is it always the fault of the individual if it does not? May not in these days the question of the relationship of the State to the individual enter into the problem, indeed even that of one State to another? The question of material necessaries—of food, clothing, and shelter—is a question of labour and trade, and often of the *international* complications of trade. It is the wider ramification of interests involved which makes all economic questions (which we know are also moral questions)—such questions as how to maintain the poorest workers in physical efficiency — so far-reaching and so terribly intricate. This is so because self-interest, indeed selfishness, is as widespread as human nature itself; also because through improved means of communication the human race is much more of a conscious unity than was formerly the case. The realization of this solidarity, of this close and sensitive independence of all the parts, even of the whole human race, when it impresses itself upon him, is apt to paralyze the earnest social worker. He realizes that in his efforts to improve the condition of those immediately about him, the interests involved are not merely those of the family, or of the place, or even of the nation to which he belongs; actually the interests of other nations are involved. Every single individual is not

only a part of all that exists; he and the whole are literally organically bound together. Thus the social question of the family, that of the possibility of the right discharge of the family relationships, broadens out circle by circle into a question of international relationships. The 'Red International,' which to-day can boast of members from Japan, Asia, Africa, Europe, and both the Americas as far as Chile, has grasped this fact from the material point of view. It is for the Church to show that she has grasped it from the spiritual and moral point of view. Only in a universal regeneration of human nature through a Christianizing of the social relationships, on the largest as well as on the smallest scale, can it be effected. If we had to work from a single centre outwards towards this ideal we might well regard the task as hopelessly beyond us. But to-day from a thousand different centres tens of thousands of earnest men and women, in different ways, are at work upon the task. These men and women belong to every branch and section of the Christian Church. They may be divided upon many points; but upon one they are agreed, namely, that in Christianity lies the hope of the future; and only by Christianizing the various social relationships can Christianity itself be spread. Two organizations, each world-wide in their scope, are at work: I was going to say, side by side; but that description would not be true, because

each is more and more penetrating the other. The so-called Social Movement is largely penetrated by Christianity; its very existence is far more due to Christianity than many of its advocates are aware. And organized Christianity, *alias* the Church, is not less penetrated by social aspirations. Alas! in both organizations there are many who are exhibiting a strange want of wisdom in the highest sense of the word. In each there are those who apparently would attempt to capture the other and turn it to their own ends. Such a policy is fatal to the success of either. I mean what I say. Even the purest humanitarianism cannot capture Christianity; history proves that. And history teaches us just as plainly that the Church is not at present co-extensive with humanitarianism. The history of the mediæval Church, as well as of some phases of Protestantism, must not be forgotten.

Both must go back to the first chapter of Genesis and to Christ's endorsement in the Gospels of the truth there asserted—'God created man in His own image . . . male and female created He them.' Revelation asserts that human nature was created after a limitless, an infinite Pattern, one limitless both in righteousness and love. To-day, as of old, those must be condemned who would separate the human and the Divine. And Christ did not say there shall be one fold, but 'one flock.' He placed

no limit. He did not say, 'Go gather all within the walls of one external, however wide an organization.' He said, Go make disciples, go baptizing all into an infinite Social Name, into a relationship of Infinite Personalities; go bury them to the old life with its selfish, self-imposed limitations and raise them to the new life with its infinite vistas and infinite possibilities. Oh, do remember the Threefold Name! It is a name which speaks to us not only of Divine Personalities, but of Divine Relationships, comprised within a Divine Unity. Each is inconceivable without the other. The Social Movement, with its many temptations to seek for, and be satisfied with, material sufficiency, must have the inspiration of the Infinite; Organized Christianity must cultivate the true humanitarianism, the Divine philanthropy of Jesus, Who was always conscious at once of man's physical, mental, moral, social, and spiritual needs. The possibilities of the Divine in the human must be remembered; and the multitude of human personalities and human interests must enter into the unity produced by the conviction of the Divine Unity. We must above all realize that man is a spiritual being with spiritual capacities, capacities for spiritual relationships, with the Father of spirits through Christ, and also, through Him, with all those who *may* be led by the Spirit who have been endowed with the capacity for the 'unity

of the Spirit.' This Holy Spirit is the penetrating, sanctifying, uniting Person of the Divine Trinity. This is He Who now, as at the first dawn of creation, is engaged in bringing all things out of a chaos into a Divinely ordered cosmos. May He, Who in every stage of the long history of God's covenant people is seen working out the Divine purpose through sanctified, consecrated, to-Christ-devoted men and women—may He sanctify and Christianize all our so-called human, but, as I have again and again shown, Divinely ordained, Social Relationships.

NOTES TO LECTURE IV

NOTE A. *The 'Failure' (?) of Christianity.* As the charge of the failure of Christianity as an instrument of moral reform and moral progress is frequently made to-day, it is important in the interests of truth that this charge should be carefully examined. The charge is made with regard to both the past and the present. These two charges should be considered separately. As an example of an indictment of the failure of Christianity as a moral power in the past we may take the chapter on 'Morality in the Ages of Faith' in Cotter Morison's *The Service of Man.* The first point to notice here is that what Mr. Morison calls 'faith' most intelligent people would call *superstition*; and superstition as a moral force is proverbially worse than useless. Actually, where in those ages we find 'faith' in the Christian (the New Testament) sense we do find (as even Mr. Morison is bound to admit) a life raised morally far above the average of the time. The second point to notice is that the comparison (Mr. Morison's) between the morality of the Middle Ages and of the present time is not a fair one; the comparison should be made between the conduct of those really under and those not under the influence of Christianity during the *same* period. When these two points are observed, Mr. Morison's charge—of the failure of Christianity as a moral influence—will be bound to be considered as 'non-proven.' An admirable brief summary of the influences of the Papacy, as the representative of Christendom—for good and evil—during the Middle Ages, will be found in the chapter 'The

Papacy at its Height' in Archbishop Trench's *Mediæval Church History* (pp. 149 ff.).

With regard to the 'failure' of Christianity to-day, it must again be remembered that the charge must be a relative and not an absolute one. A perfectly legitimate question is, What would have been, or what would be, the moral and social conditions of either the poor parts of our large towns or of our country villages *without* the influences, direct and indirect, of Christianity which have been, or are being, brought to bear upon them? In the aggregate the results of these Christian influences are very great. There is no more fallacious test of Christian influence than the number of persons regularly attending places of worship in a poor district. The real work is being done in the homes, the schools, the various religious institutions, and the numberless little meetings and small societies from which, as centres, Christian influences are permeating the life of the whole population. The recently marked decrease in intemperance is largely due to the 'spade work' which has for many years been done among the children in Bands of Hope and among adults in many little temperance meetings by various Christian denominations. Christianity and true philanthropy are never far apart, and thousands of social workers to-day, whose work seems very indirectly connected with religion, are finding their inspiration in a public opinion which, as the result of Christian teaching, is becoming more and more penetrated with the Christian spirit and with Christian ideals. The greatest hindrance to Christianity to-day is not in the slums, but in the influence of the idle, selfish, pleasure-loving rich, not a few of whom live by the oppression of the poor. Many of these people profess to be Christians, and even attend our churches; but they set the poor a

bad example, especially that of a wholly materialistic standard of life, and such a standard is to those who are almost wholly uneducated far more immediately attractive than a spiritual one.

NOTE B. '*Fraternity*' *and* '*Brotherhood.*' Upon this subject there is an excellent chapter in Professor MacCunn's *Ethics of Citizenship*. 'Modern Democracy,' he writes, 'at its inauguration a hundred years ago, was loud in its professions of Universal Fraternity.' But 'it would be idle to pretend that these aspirations, so far as Democracy has in the interval gone, have been adequately realized.' He then quotes Carlyle: 'Call ye that a Society where there is no longer any Social Idea extant; not so much as the idea of a Common Home, but only of a common and over-crowded Lodging-house, where each, isolated, regardless of his neighbour, turned against his neighbour, clutches what he can get and cries "Mine!" and calls it Peace, because in the cut-purse and cut-throat Scramble no steel knives, but only a far cunninger sort, can be employed?' (*Sartor Resartus*, bk. iii. ch. v.). Professor MacCunn then goes on to speak of 'the disintegrating spirit of individual competition which is Fraternity's very negation.' He then points out the effect of analogies drawn from Biological Science, where for 'Struggle for Existence' we may read 'competition'; for 'Survival of the Fittest' 'successful self-seeking'; and for 'Extinction of the Unfit' 'failure and poverty.' Still he believes that 'as a fact the spirit of Fraternity is anything but dead,' *e.g.* it survives within the Family group, it survives also in 'the tie of Friendship': its existence is also proved in Foreign Missionary work. Whence, then, must we look for the reality for which

'Fraternity' is the name? Professor MacCunn points to 'that attitude to our neighbour which asserts itself as soon as one man discerns in another that common moral spirit which is, and ever more becomes, the most real thing in man' (p. 27). 'Fraternity stands,' he believes, 'on spiritual fact.' It is only when a man is 'possessed by a conviction of the reality and the indestructibility of the relation of Man to God' that a true Fraternity is possible. In other words, the Fraternity of men depends on the realization of the Fatherhood of God. It is from the want of this conviction, from the want of a belief in the Divine Fatherhood, that so many modern schemes of, and attempts at, Fraternity have proved and are proving failures. Two other points Professor MacCunn notices: first, how rich in practical applications is the old doctrine, 'members one of another'; for instance, 'In civilized society man stands at all times in need of the co-operation and assistance of great multitudes . . . on no other condition could we be even housed, clothed, and fed. It is this practical Fraternity that keeps us alive.' In fact, we are *dependent* on each other: and here, as we know, Christianity bids us remember that dependence must rise into *fellowship*, and into all that 'fellowship' should imply. The second point is, we must remember that 'our affections begin at home. How else can they begin? They have their roots in common memories, in habitual association, in mutual knowledge, in well-tried sympathy and fidelity. Where these things are not, it is idle to ask for the deep and tender feelings that enhance the private and personal relationships of life.' All this is only a further proof of what I have insisted upon so often in these lectures—the importance of the home, and of the home atmosphere and

training. And there is no fear, if this is what it should be, of its having a narrowing influence, of its ending in 'family selfishness'; for we find that 'one of the considerations which give dignity and significance to the private affections, is that, if genuine, they cannot spend themselves wholly within the lesser circles of Family or Friendship, but pass outwards with a spontaneous generosity to the remoter relationships.'

NOTE C. *Eugenics.* The importance of this science or field of study is rapidly becoming more widely recognized. Already the literature on the subject (even in English) has become extensive. As an introduction to the study of the subject, the following will be found useful: (1) A paper by Mr. Francis Galton entitled 'Eugenics: Its Definition, Scope, and Aims,' which, together with comments upon it by Professor Karl Pearson, Dr. Maudsley, and others, is printed in *Sociological Papers, 1st series* (Macmillan); (2) another paper, also by Mr. Galton, in the *3rd series* of the same work. In the third section of this paper Mr. Galton speaks of 'Eugenics as a Factor in Religion.' 'Eugenics,' he says, 'strengthens the sense of social duty in so many particulars that the conclusions derived from its study ought to find a welcome home in every tolerant religion. It promotes a far-sighted philanthropy, the acceptance of parentage as a serious responsibility, and a higher conception of patriotism.' It is, of course, as he adds, 'founded on the idea of evolution,' but 'not on a passive form of it,' but 'under that conception of it which assumes an infinitely more interesting aspect under the knowledge that the intelligent action of the human will is, in some small measure, capable of guiding its course.

Man has the power of doing this largely so far as the evolution of humanity is concerned.' Mr. Galton further states that 'Eugenic belief extends the function of philanthropy to future generations; it renders its action more pervading than hitherto, by dealing with families and societies in their entirety, and it enforces the importance of the marriage covenant by directing serious attention to the probable quality of the future offspring. It sternly forbids all forms of sentimental charity that are harmful to the race, while it eagerly seeks opportunity for acts of personal kindness, as some equivalent to the loss of what it forbids. It brings the tie of kinship into prominence and strongly encourages love and interest in family and race. In brief, Eugenics is a virile creed, full of hopefulness, and appealing to many of the noblest feelings of our nature.'

NOTE D. *The City of God.* To understand the Apocalypse we must remember, that while its inspiration and teaching are Christian, the *form* of the teaching is intensely Jewish. The following, from Professor A. B. Davidson's *Old Testament Prophecy* (pp. 310 f.), will explain what I mean: 'The conception of heaven, so familiar to us, was unknown to the prophets—I mean heaven as the abode or final dwelling-place of the perfected people of God. Heaven was the abode of God; the abode of man was earth. The perfection of the people of God was attained not by their being translated to the sphere of God's abode, but by His coming down and dwelling among them. In all the Old Testament prophets the Church of God made perfect still dwells upon earth, though it is a transfigured earth. The picture drawn of this final condition may appear to

our minds a singular union of the natural and the miraculous, of the ordinary conceptions of human life with a presence of God which might seem to render them impossible. And probably the pictures drawn could not in truth be realized. They are the result of two great conceptions combined—a very realistic idea of man and human life, which regarded man altogether as he is seen, a being complex, but a unity of body and mind, and who therefore required a physical sphere to afford scope and play to his powers; and, secondly, a very vivid idea of God, as the source of all life and power in man, and of His presence as the source of all blessedness.' These words, I believe, give us exactly the right point of view from which to approach the study of the two final chapters of the Apocalypse. Upon the 'practical'—may I say the social?—teaching of these chapters much has of recent years been written, but no one has, I think, brought out the lessons for the present of the vision of the City of God more clearly than Dr. A. M. Fairbairn in the final chapter of his *City of God* (pp. 349 ff.). The following sentences may be quoted:—

'The city accentuated the idea of the Divine law or will realised in man's free and ordered and richly beautiful social life.'

'The city of God is the society of godlike spirits with all their godlike capabilities and affinities in exercise and development, moving, as it were, out of their imperfection as creatures to the perfection loved and desired of the Creator.'

'We can certainly say that man's belief in the city of God, with all it involves, has created ideals, awakened enthusiasms, inspired hopes, developed energies and

agencies that have lessened the miseries, increased the happiness, enlarged the liberties, augmented the righteousness and quickened the progress of mankind.'

'City is the synonym for Society in its richest and most varied forms; there the privileges, rights, liberties, and honours of citizenship are combined with the grandest opportunities of mutual service, the ministries of love and devotion, the fellowship of living minds. . . . Isolation engenders the selfishness which is spiritual death; life dutifully lived in society calls the better qualities of the man into activity and strength. . . . The city of God but means that the ideal of each man and of all his relationships is being realized.'

But the whole chapter should be carefully studied, especially by those who would—as all should strive to—maintain the highest ideals and aspirations in Christian social service.

NOTE E. *The Importance and Function of Psychology.* I fear there are still a considerable number of Christian teachers and Christian social workers (including, I should say, from my own experience, a somewhat large proportion of the clergy) who have not yet recognized the value of a knowledge of psychology, even an elementary one, if scientific so far as it goes. To teachers, for giving them an insight into the greatness of this value, I would commend Professor W. James' *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*; social workers I should strongly recommend to read at least the introductory chapter to McDougall's *Social Psychology.* From this latter I would quote the following, first, as a definition: 'Psychology [is] the science which claims to formulate the body of ascertained truths about the

constitution and working of the mind, and which endeavours to refine and to add to this knowledge.' Mr. McDougall believes, and I think with every justification, that 'psychology will before long be accorded in universal practice the position at the base of the social sciences which the more clear sighted have long seen that it ought to occupy.' He proceeds to state that the department of psychology which is of primary importance for the social sciences is 'that which deals with the springs of human action, the impulses and motives that sustain mental and bodily activity, and regulate conduct.' [This must not be interpreted to mean the *ultimate* springs or ultimate motives, for psychology does not deal with ultimate sources.] He shows how psychology depends upon biology, and how closely it is connected with ethics, because 'any writer upon ethics necessarily encounters psychological problems on every hand.' As an example of 'a very important advance of psychology towards usefulness,' Mr. McDougall adduces 'the increasing recognition of the extent to which the adult human mind is the product of the moulding influence exerted by the social environment.' As an illustration of the result of a want of knowledge of psychology he cites the following: 'What other than an error due to false psychological assumption was the cosmopolitanism of the Manchester school with its confident prophecy of the brotherhood of man brought about by enlightened self-interest assigning to each region and people the work for which it was best suited? This prophecy has been notoriously falsified by a great outburst of national spirit which has played the chief part in fashioning European history during the last half-century.' 'Social psychology,' he writes, 'has to show how, given the

native propensities and capacities of the individual human mind, all the complex mental life of societies is shaped by them, and in turn re-acts upon the course of their development and operation in the individual.' Thus 'the fundamental problem of social psychology is the moralization of the individual by the society into which he is born as a creature in which the non-moral and purely egoistic tendencies are so much stronger than any altruistic tendencies.' The last words of his introduction are: 'My object is to bring home to the reader the truth that the understanding of the life of society in any or all of its phases pre-supposes a knowledge of the constitution of the human mind, a truth which, though occasionally acknowledged in principle, is in practice so frequently ignored.'

NOTE F. *Religion and Science.* I have spoken in this lecture of the conflict between religion and physical science being largely a thing of the past. Professor Peabody goes even further than this: 'Fortunately for us all this controversy between science and religion has had its day, and the pathetic history of superfluous antagonism and of misplaced loyalty now interests only a few belated materialists and a few overslept defenders of the faith. . . . Nor has the issue of this momentous conflict been a truce, as though each party had withdrawn to its own territory and were guarding its frontier against hostile raids. Science and faith have discovered a common territory which they possess, not as rivals, but as allies. Faith has committed itself to scientific method; science has recognized that its work begins in faith. "The world of science is a world of faith . . . the faith which is the basis of religion and theology is only the

extension and completion of this faith that the universe is a perfect and organic whole." Thus the most alarming intellectual conflict of the last generation has already become of merely historical interest to the thought of to-day' (*The Religion of an Educated Man*, pp. 4, 5).

Is this extremely optimistic judgment altogether justified? Not, I fear, unless we are careful to define its terms. Of the greatest and most highly educated thinkers in both the regions of religion and science I believe it is very largely true. But the ordinary Christian social worker has not to deal with these. He has not to deal with men who are studying religion with the humility of the truly scientific mind, and by truly scientific methods; nor has he to deal with scientific men who are perfectly aware of the true limits of science. He has not to deal with men who, in Professor Peabody's own words, recognize that, 'The religious nature is no more abnormal and revolutionary than the physical or the intellectual life of man'; and that 'it is not a scene of catastrophes and pathological excesses, but of a silent process of evolution and education, not without friction, reversion, and effort, but with a general movement of expansion, progress, and growth.'

Our difficulties to-day appear to arise mainly from two classes of people, both of whom are very imperfectly educated. The first are 'religiously minded people' who have a very imperfect knowledge of science and of scientific methods; these fear the introduction of the scientific mind and scientific method into what they regard as the peculiar territory of religion. The second class are those who hold aloof from religion partly at least because they are still in that stage of the conflict, out of which, if

Professor Peabody had been more correct, he would have said that 'the *educated thinkers* have passed.'

It has recently been stated that the real conflict of the present is not one between religion and science but between rival philosophies and rival systems of ethics. In this view, I believe, there is much truth.

The task before the Christian teacher to-day is to commend the Christian philosophy, *i.e.* the Christian interpretation of man and society, and, founded upon these, the Christian ethic. He must show the truth of these when tried by really scientific tests; first, that of experience, secondly, that of ability to explain all the various processes and phenomena of life.

If I may venture to attempt to put the present difficulty very briefly, I would express it thus: The great majority (the rank and file) of religious teachers and workers lack scientific mindedness. On the other hand, those more or less outside the influences of religion fail to take account of some of the strongest and most real forces in the universe and also of some of the strongest and most real elements in human nature, which is that upon which these forces act, and which to these forces responds. [Among these forces we must be most careful to include that of *sin*.]

NOTE G. *The Psychology of Religion.* Those to whom this subject is new may be recommended to Professor Starbuck's book with this title. The following brief résumé of the chief points in the first few pages of his introductory chapter may induce some to study a subject which, if pursued in the right spirit, cannot fail to be helpful. The chapter begins with the following definition of object: 'The Psychology of Religion has

for its work to carry the well-established methods of science into the analysis and organization of the facts of the religious consciousness, and to ascertain the laws which determine its growth and character.' The author realizes that many, at least at first, will deprecate the introduction of 'science' into the sphere of religion; yet 'those who believe that law reigns, not only in the physical world but in the mental and spiritual—that we live in a lawful universe,—and who believe that we are helped in becoming lawful creatures by comprehending the order that reigns, will hail this new development with gladness.' He then proceeds to show how our knowledge of law has invaded one field after another of investigation, and how 'in the physical world caprice and chance have been eliminated.' Already we assume that 'in the mental life there are laws as dominant and unchangeable, although these are of a different character.' In the study of the Psychology of Religion 'we go one step further, and affirm that there is no event in the spiritual life which does not occur in accordance with immutable laws.' It is this assertion (or assumption) to which many religious people will, at first sight, object. They will say it directly contradicts our Lord's saying about the action of the Spirit in St. John iv. 8. But on the words 'the wind bloweth where it listeth' Bishop Westcott writes: 'The phrase is not to be pressed physically. The wind obeys its own proper laws, which depend on a complication of phenomena [forces acting according to laws] which we cannot [as yet] calculate, and therefore for us it is a natural image of freedom.' We may also remember St. Paul's assertion in 1 Cor. xiv. 33, *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ Θεὸς*.

Professor Starbuck draws attention to the difference

between the 'philosophy' and the 'psychology' of religion. The philosophy of religion insists on seeing the whole, whereas 'the psychology of religion sees in the scattered facts of religious experiences an evidence that spiritual forces are at work.' He states that 'psychology is to religion what the science of medicine is to health.' He then proceeds to show 'what religion may hope to gain by a study of its nature and laws'; I would venture to add 'and also of its forces.' He believes it will lead 'toward greater wisdom in religious education.' 'The time is almost past when we entrust our children in school to a teacher who does not know something of psychology.' [This may be true in America, I fear it is still far from true in England.] Professor Starbuck believes that 'it will become a commonplace to say that a religious teacher cannot stand between a hungering soul and its future self, or between men and God, who does not know something of the laws of spiritual evolution. . . . That the soul be no longer left to drift aimlessly and to select chance objects for its expression or remain without an object, is partially to be the work of the psychology of religion.'

The concluding sentences of the chapter, which sum up the purpose of a study of the psychology of religion, are as follows: 'The end in view is not to classify and define the phenomena of religion, but to see into the laws and processes at work in the spiritual life. The fundamental assumption is that religion is a real fact of human experience, and develops according to law. Although these laws are peculiar to their own sphere . . . the facts have an order which, given wisdom enough, may be ascertained. The service of psychology to practical religion is to make possible a harvest of wiser means in moral

and religious culture, and also to lift religion sufficiently out of the domain of feeling to make it appeal to the understanding, so that it may become possible, progressively, to appreciate its truth and apperceive its essential elements.'

NOTE H. *The Clergy as Ambassadors.* The conception of the Christian pastor as an ambassador flows naturally from the idea of an 'apostolic' function. In my *Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul* I have written: 'The idea of the "apostle" is that of one near to Christ, yet commissioned to represent Him and His cause, sent on a mission for this purpose, with full personal responsibility, and into whose mission or work the full personality enters. In this way he is distinguished from the ἄγγελος who might be the bearer of a sealed letter, or charged to convey a verbally exact message. Thus the apostle has the responsibility, not only of actually representing Christ, but of applying his commission as skilfully as possible to special needs and circumstances' (p. 115). Remembering this, the apostle may be said to be charged with the function and work of the ambassador. Upon this function Bishop Lightfoot wrote: 'What ideas are involved in this image of an ambassador? We may sum up the conception, I think, in three words, *commission, representation, diplomacy.* The ambassador, before acting, receives a commission. . . . The ambassador, while acting, acts not only as an agent, but as a representative of his sovereign. Lastly, the ambassador's duty is not merely to deliver a definite message, to carry out a definite policy; but he is obliged to watch opportunities, to study characters, to cast about for expedients so that he may place it before his hearers in its most

attractive form. He is a diplomatist' (*Ordination Addresses*, p. 47 f.).

There is an admirable treatment of 'The Mission of the Church in Society' in the chapter so entitled in Bishop Gore's *The Mission of the Church*, from which I would quote the following: 'The moral law, unchanging as it is, we are to seek to commend to the consciences of all men, specially by finding its affinity to the moral tendencies and aspirations of our own time. We are to discern the signs of the times, for good as for evil; always to keep our eye on the unchanging law of Christ, and also always on the changing wants and aspirations of men round about us; so shall we fill the office of interpreters' (pp. 140 f.)

NOTE I. *The Knowledge of the Christian Social Worker.* Many years ago the late Mr. Spurgeon wrote a book in which he devoted a whole chapter to 'The Worker with a Slender Apparatus'; this title, I think, exactly defines the conditions under which a multitude of social workers are labouring to-day; it accounts for their own inefficiency, and also for the inefficacy of their work. To begin with, they do not see how many and what various factors enter into the problems they are trying to solve. They do not realize the intimate interrelation of these. For instance, they do not see how closely mental and moral states are related to physical or material conditions; again, they do not realize how inability to make self-effort or to exercise self-discipline is due to the want of those forces of character which religion, in this sense practically synonymous with faith, alone can supply.

Ideally we ought to demand from the social worker a

knowledge of sociology as certainly as we demand from the medical practitioner a knowledge of anatomy and physiology. But at present we are at once met with these questions, What do you mean by sociology? Is there a field of scientific knowledge capable of such scientific investigation to which this term can properly be applied? Is not 'sociology' actually a loose and somewhat general term carelessly used to cover a great variety of different fields of knowledge, most of which at present are very imperfectly investigated? But surely every science has to develop, and certainly at present the science of sociology, compared with some other sciences, is in a very undeveloped condition; but to admit this is not to admit that the knowledge of it we already possess is useless, or that it is not our duty to try to increase this knowledge.

As a useful working definition, I am prepared to term sociology the scientific study of society, and of all the phenomena it exhibits, including the various forces and processes at work within and upon it. So far as method of study is concerned, I believe Herbert Spencer is entirely correct, *i.e.* our method must be inductive: where he fails is in his dealing with the ultimate source and ultimate end of both the individual and society. What Bishop Westcott said of Comte's philosophy must also be said of that of Herbert Spencer, that 'it lacks the Christian elements of infinity and personality which we necessarily crave,' or, to express it still more briefly, it fails to take account of all (indeed of the most important) factors in the problem. But his method is right. And to-day the beginner in the study of sociology can hardly do better than commence with Spencer's *Study of Sociology*. It will open his eyes to the immense number and the

immense variety of the problems involved. In this book Spencer shows that some knowledge of what he terms (1) The Abstract, (2) The Abstract-Concrete, and (3) The Organic sciences is essential; because 'social phenomena involve phenomena of every order.' If I were asked for the most common of all the causes of the disappointment with which the social worker is so frequently afflicted, I should answer, 'the want of the cultivation of a scientific habit of mind.' Comparatively few social workers, I fear, carry into their work 'conceptions of continuity, complexity, and contingency of causation, as well as the conception of fructifying causation,' ideas which should always be present with those who are studying life in any of its manifold forms. Herbert Spencer, again, is entirely right in demanding some knowledge of biology and psychology. What I would specially add is, that from our study of sociology we must not separate a study of ethics. Then, above all, as Christians we cannot separate from it the fundamental convictions of Christianity, that is so far as these deal with ultimate causes and ultimate issues. Whatever be our views as to the processes by which sin works, we must recognize the *fact* of sin as a force at work within both the individual and society.

I may be met with the objection that it is all very well to speak in scientific language of forces acting according to law when we are dealing with the inorganic creation or with organic creation outside man, but that from what we know of human nature it is impossible to speak in these terms of man. I am quite prepared to admit that 'the entanglement of the factors and the contingency of the results is so great' that often the 'definite relations of antecedents and consequents cannot be established,'

and also that 'the processes of causation are so involved as often to be inexplicable,' yet the scientific habit of mind convinces us that 'there *is* causation, no less necessary and no less exact than causation of simpler kinds.'

No one can have moved in and out among many social workers without seeing that even now the great majority of them forget this, and act as if the law of causation did not apply in the human and social sphere. The scientific worker does not forget this; if he goes wrong it is, like Herbert Spencer and others, in forgetting, or in laying too little stress upon, those forces which we term 'spiritual.' St. Paul's assertion in 1 Cor. ii. 14 ff. is absolutely true and proved by daily experience: 'The natural man (ψυχικὸς) rejects the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him, and [so] he cannot know [γνῶναι = perceive] because they are discerned [after a thorough examination] by the insight into the things of the Spirit which results from the Spirit's indwelling and therefore the possession of the spiritual sense.' From the want of a sufficiently delicate instrument or of one of sufficiently high power we might be unable to detect the presence or movement of some factor in a physiological or astronomical investigation; and this failure would vitiate our conclusions. The failure (and the consequences of the failure) to discern the spiritual in man and in society is exactly analogous. To deny the existence of this factor is most unscientific, for without it there is much which we cannot explain.

Put very briefly, the object of this note is to appeal to every Christian social worker to enlarge and enrich his equipment to the highest possible degree, and above all to cultivate the scientific mind, which is only another

term for a faith in the orderliness of the universe—to believe that it is a cosmos and not a chaos. It is not the truly scientific, but the unscientific, workers who really lack faith in the order and righteousness of God.

The more we know of man and of society the more wisely can we affect both for good. A knowledge of man presupposes some knowledge of biology and psychology and ethics and religion. A knowledge of sociology thus assumes some knowledge of all these.

I might have added that we must also have a knowledge of 'economics,' but to deal with that subject would have required more space than I can give; besides, economics is not, so far as man is concerned, absolutely unconnected with biology, because structure and the performance of function alike assume a due supply of the aliment of all kinds needed by man. How he may best and most surely obtain this is the object of a study of economics.

NOTE J. *That Self-control is positive.* 'Emphasis on will and action means emphasis on self-control as a prime condition of character and of happiness and of influence . . . if self-control is the chief differentiation of the human and sane life from the animal and insane life, then the positive conditions of self-control are at the same time primary elements in the right, the happy, and the influential life.'

'Self-mastery must not be a mere restraint, a holding ourselves back; it must be a positive and definite making the lower serve the higher.'

'The true psychological method is always positive, not merely negatively fighting a thought, trying to withhold attention from it (which only holds it the more

certainly in mind), but positively turning the attention to some other thought—not refusing to attend to this, but positively attending to something else' (Professor H. C. King, *Rational Living—Some Practical Inferences from Modern Psychology*, pp. 180 ff.). See also a sermon by Dr. Chalmers on 'The Expulsive Power of a New Affection.'

ADDITIONAL NOTE

THE MORAL AND SOCIAL TEACHING OF EPHESIANS IV—VI

The extraordinary wealth of the ethical, and so of the social, teaching of the last three chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians is only realized after the most careful study of these chapters from this definite point of view. Their value for inspiration and guidance to the Christian social worker cannot be exaggerated. Undoubtedly the subject which in the first seventeen verses of chapter iv. seems to claim special attention is 'The Unity of the Church,' but further study shows, that not only does this unity rest upon an ethical basis, and proceed from a single ethical source, but that the chief object or purpose for which it must be maintained, and which it is designed to serve, is also ethical. At the same time it must be clearly noticed, that while throughout St. Paul pleads for the supreme claim and supreme importance of the ethical, to him the ethical cannot be separated, even for a moment, from the theological. This is sometimes expressed by saying how closely in this passage doctrine and exhortation are interwoven. Indeed we may assert, that for every demand for ethical conduct or behaviour a theological reason is given. Among other truths which these chapters should engrave upon our minds must stand this—the impossibility of separating life and conduct, as these should be, from the inspiration

and guidance of Christian truth, and therefore the futility of expecting permanently good results from social work which is not governed by Christian principles. When we speak of the first part of chapter iv. insisting upon 'The Unity of the Church,' we must remember those dicta of Professor Hort (which I have previously quoted),[1] first, 'that the Christian life is the true human life and that Christians become true men in proportion as they live up to it'; and secondly, 'that the right relations between the members of the Christian Society or Ecclesia are simply the normal relations which should exist between members of the human race.' Thus the Christian social reformer will not be content to speak of these verses inculcating the need for unity of spirit in the Church, they will speak to him of the need of the unity of the Spirit in every human society small or large; they should also speak to all professing members of every organized society of Christians of the need for their making the life of that society a model of what all social life should be.

What I would particularly insist upon here is the immense value of a clear conception of the teaching of these chapters as (I would venture to say) an *essential* part of the Christian social worker's equipment. The following seem to be the chief factors in their teaching:—

First, the theological foundation or basis of Christian conduct is never lost sight of; the ethical teaching and practice depends upon the *revelation* of the nature and will of the Father, of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit: (1) There is one God Who is Father of all; we are to be imitators of God; the ideal will be the realization of the Kingdom of God; the wrath of God comes upon those who disobey His will. (2) There is

[1] pp. 32, 33.

one Lord; the gifts we have, for instance the capacities and opportunities for service, we owe to Christ: every member of the ideal society and every relationship between every member will be filled with the life and nature of Christ, to the full knowledge of Whom we should strive to attain; the ideal to us is Jesus, the historic manifestation of the Christ. (3) There is one and only one uniting Spirit, a personal Spirit acting upon us, and grieved by that in us which is in opposition to the holiness of His nature, &c.

Secondly, we have a definite and clear doctrine or philosophy of man, which is founded upon the equally clear doctrine of God. This doctrine of man includes at least the elements of a psychology of man, including also a doctrine of conscience and a doctrine of sin, besides a doctrine of the means whereby sin may be overcome. (A careful study will reveal examples of each of these.)

Thirdly, we have, as I have already indicated, a definite doctrine of society, both as it is and as it should be and may be. A study of St. Paul's comparison between society and the human organism will show not only how many analogies there are between these, but also the insufficiency of the human organism to furnish a complete analogy to society. It might be said that in these chapters we have at least hints, or perhaps rather traces, of a psychology of society.

Fourthly, the ethical is everywhere supreme, and the origin of the ethical is God. The want of the ethical in the human world, and the misery consequent on this, is due to want of communion (one of both intelligence and love) with God; it is due to separation from Him, largely due to an ignorance (which is more or less

culpable) and also to disobedience, and it issues in greater ignorance and still further disobedience.

The mistakes made (and the consequent failures) in Christian social work and Christian social reform to-day usually arise from forgetfulness of one or more of these various constituents in the Apostle's teaching.

The most common of these mistakes, and so the most usual cause of disappointment, arises from an inadequate conception of the power of sin, and so of the proportion of evil due to sin. Those who are working at the present time must not be wholly blamed for this. Until a few years ago there was a totally inadequate conception of the evil influence of evil circumstances, and also of the responsibility of those better off for the evil circumstances among which many of the very poor are existing. By an inevitable swing of the pendulum, partly due to an immense and very rapid increase in knowledge of the power and effects of the assimilation of environment, the importance of circumstances is now receiving, I will not say too great attention, but a disproportionate amount of attention. While we can hardly lay too much stress upon the importance of favourable circumstances, we are tempted to lay, indeed actually are laying, far too little stress upon sin—manifested in culpable ignorance, selfishness, wilfulness, intemperance, impurity, oppression, &c. [I place 'culpable' ignorance first because the amount of this, and the magnitude of the evils arising from it, are both greater than we have generally the courage to declare.]

The central point, the pivot of St. Paul's teaching, lies in the 23rd verse of the fourth chapter—'and that ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind.' It is impossible to exaggerate the importance or the wealth of

the teaching which these few words contain. St. Paul's doctrines of God, man, and salvation are all implied. To those who would try to enter into the depths of the meaning of these words I would commend, first, a careful study of Bishop Westcott's notes on them in his *Ephesians*, and secondly, the chapter in Dr. Dale's *Ephesians* entitled 'Moral Regeneration' (pp. 308 ff.).

The word for renewed is ἀνανεοῦσθαι (an ἅπαξ λεγ. in the N.T.). Its true significance is seen in Col. iii. 9, where we have ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον. It is not the old character which requires freshening up, but a new character, a *different* one, which needs constant renewal. How seldom, I fear, does the social worker speak of or even see the necessity for this in those he would help, *i.e.* of their being born 'anew'! Yet here, if he recognized it, his best hope of success lies. It is not that a process must be repeated, but that a man 'must be introduced into connection with a new order of being with a corresponding endowment of faculties' (Westcott, *St. John*, p. 48).

Why I lay such stress upon this is that the demand for this change by St. Paul precedes the exhortation in iv. 25 ff. in which he now deals with the 'Outward manifestation of the Christian Life, personal and social.' It is the new spiritual endowment, constantly renewed, which will enable a man to give up the old *unsocial* sins and habits, and, in their place, to acquire social virtues, and to live a truly social life. Lying, stealing, corrupt speech, bitterness, &c., are all unsocial actions springing from unsocial sins. In the place of these there must be truth, honest labour, and helpfulness of others, edifying speech, kindness, compassion, and the forgiving spirit.

I have spoken throughout these lectures on the need

of moralizing, of Christianizing, the social relationships, but for effecting this the moralizing and the Christianizing of the character is an indispensable condition. The social relationships are undoubtedly means and instruments whereby character is affected, and through a highly moral and Christian relationship (*alias* a good influence) a character may be moralized and Christianized; but there must be some moral and Christian power in the *one influencing* to effect this. A. wishes to gain an influence upon B. in order that the relationship between B. and C., D., E., &c. may be Christianized, *i.e.* that B. may behave to these as he ought. In order that B. may do this his character must be Christianized, and this must be done largely through the influence of A. upon him; so A.'s influence must be directed to getting B. to go through the three steps described in verses 22 and 23 of the chapter we are considering. All this does not diminish the importance of environment, for growth does not depend *only* on the vital principle or power, but upon the environment from whence it draws the materials for growth. Character and environment act and react continuously upon each other. Where the error is being so constantly made to-day lies in thinking that alteration of environment (however excellent and however great) is *in itself* sufficient. We forget our Lord's great dictum: 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.'

The words ὑμᾶς . . . ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν are important for another reason—as revealing to us something, at least, of St. Paul's psychology. Every action of will may be said to be the third stage in a process. These three processes may be termed those of (1) impression (due to stimulus), (2) reasoning, and

(3) expression (or action). The nature of the third stage depends upon the second as well as upon the first, though frequently this second stage is so weak, or so momentary, or so imperfectly performed, that we might sometimes speak of the nature of the third stage being due to its absence. Now the constant renewal of the spirit of the mind is needed in order that this second stage may be well and properly performed. Where it takes place is a kind of 'high court' of character in which what may be termed instincts, impulses, wishes are judged, and where purposes are determined. Hence the infinite importance of its moral efficiency.

We must, of course, recognize that this efficiency is largely influenced by the human or personal environment through which good or evil influences act upon it. When we speak of 'environment,' the *personal* factors in this, as I have before noticed, must not be forgotten, for these are at once the strongest and the most important.

The following note of Meyer's, though not entirely satisfactory, will be found helpful in explaining St. Paul's meaning: 'The πνεῦμα . . . is the higher *life-principle* in man, *the moral power akin to God* in him, the seat of moral self-consciousness and of moral self-determination. This πνεῦμα, which forms the moral personality of man, the Ego of his higher ζωή turned towards God, has as the organ of its vital exercise—as the faculty of its moral operation—the νοῦς, that is, the reason in its ethical quality and activity . . . and it puts the νοῦς at the service of the Divine will . . . in an assent to the moral practice of this Divine will.'

There is one consideration which the would-be-successful social reformer will not fail to impress upon those he would try to influence, which is admirably

expressed by Dr. Dale: 'The constant renewal of the spiritual life is the work of the Spirit of God; but we are not the merely passive subjects of His grace. It is our *duty* to "*be renewed.*" We are required to form the moral and spiritual habits which render possible, and which secure, the fresh access from day to day of Divine inspiration. There should be habitual remembrance of the power and goodness of the Spirit. . . . There should be habitual trust in Him as the Giver of light, of strength, of joy, and of righteousness. . . . There should be habitual prayer for His teaching and His strong support . . .' (*Ephesians*, p. 316).

I have expanded this additional note at some length because in it I wished to re-emphasize the conviction I have tried to set forth in my final lecture, viz. that in Christianity, read in the light of our latest discoveries in mental, moral, and social science, and also in the light of an enlarged experience (gained from a more careful reading of history), we have a power amply sufficient, when intelligently understood and applied, to reform not only the individual character, but also (what cannot be separated from it) the social relationships, which are affected by, and in turn affect, all with whom we come in contact; and consequently, through the reformation of these social relationships, we have a power sufficient to reform society itself. As the student of the physical sciences is always looking forward to fresh discoveries which may prove extremely helpful to man, so must the student of mental and moral science look forward to the discovery of new knowledge with regard to moral and spiritual powers or forces, and to new means of applying these which may be helpful to man in an even higher degree. To the Christian all

these various forces, whether physical, mental, moral or spiritual, are alike in a true sense Divine, for they equally proceed from the One Source of all power and they all act according to His determined methods or laws.

It is for the furtherance of this high utilitarian purpose that to-day we specially need the student, the investigator, the thinker, as well as the so-called 'worker.' And we need the thinker in the field of Social Reform as much as he is needed in any other sphere of knowledge and of work.

Upon the paramount need, in all our investigations and in all our work, of bearing always in mind our dependence upon the 'supernatural' (I would prefer to say the 'Divine Power') let me conclude with the following words of Dr. Dale: 'Whenever the supernatural in the Christian revelation is suppressed or concealed, whenever it does not hold the chief place, the moral power of Christianity is broken. The earth is kept in her orbit by the attraction of the sun which rules her from heaven; and man is rescued from vice and disciplined to virtue by the righteousness and love of God. The laws of human duty come from those eternal and Divine things by which human life is environed; and the life and vigour for the noblest forms of human perfection come from Divine and eternal fountains. Human nature can never bear the image of the Divine righteousness, until it is penetrated, inspired and transfigured by the Divine Spirit. Christian faith is the root of Christian morality' (*Ephesians*, p. 348).

THE END

Spottiswoode & Co. Ltd., Printers, Colchester, London and Eton

DATE DUE

APR 0 4 1996

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

HN31 .C4 c.1
Chadwick, William F[illegible] 100106 000
Social relationsh[illegible]e li

3 9310 00014863 3
GOSHEN COLLEGE-GOOD LIBRARY

P
261
C34a

70396

Goshen College Library
Goshen, Indiana

Peace
HN
31
C4